



# BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 20275

**Title:** TIPS combining with other interventional treatments for HCC with portal hypertension: long-term observation.

**Reviewer's code:** 00807135

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Jin-Lei Wang

**Date sent for review:** 2015-06-05 11:00

**Date reviewed:** 2015-07-16 09:12

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this study, the authors evaluated the long-term clinical safety and efficacy of TIPS combining with other interventional treatments for patients with HCC and portal hypertension. the main idea is interesting because there is limited data in this population. Comments 1 Some language polishing need to be corrected. A native English speaker is required to proof the manuscript. 2 The sentence in the introduction is very long. It should be summarized. 3 The "follow up" should be re-arranged. 4 References should be update.



# BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 20275

**Title:** TIPS combining with other interventional treatments for HCC with portal hypertension: long-term observation.

**Reviewer's code:** 02155130

**Reviewer's country:** Italy

**Science editor:** Jin-Lei Wang

**Date sent for review:** 2015-06-05 11:00

**Date reviewed:** 2015-07-16 09:17

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Interesting study with limited data in patients with cirrhosis and portal hypertension complicated with HCC. 1) The "result" and "method" part should be clarify. The result (for example, characteristics of included patients, tumors, treatment received) should be placed in the "result" part of the manuscript. 2) The result of patients characteristics should be checked again. 3) What were the indications for TIPS placement? It should be clearly stated.



ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology
ESPS manuscript NO: 20275
Title: TIPS combining with other interventional treatments for HCC with portal hypertension: long-term observation.
Reviewer's code: 02941224
Reviewer's country: Thailand
Science editor: Jin-Lei Wang
Date sent for review: 2015-06-05 11:00
Date reviewed: 2015-06-23 11:48

Table with 4 columns: CLASSIFICATION, LANGUAGE EVALUATION, SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT, CONCLUSION. It contains checkboxes for various quality and misconduct criteria.

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this study, the authors describe the safety and efficacy of TIPS in patients with cirrhosis and portal hypertension complicated with HCC. In my point of view, the main idea is interesting because there is limited data in this population, however many parts of the manuscript are quite redundant and needed major corrections. Moreover, it should be grammatically corrected and rewritten in a universally-accepted format. 1. There are lots of grammatical errors throughout the text, especially symbol errors. For example, in the first sentence of introduction "...deaths each year, The mortality ...", should be replaced with. . 2. "The mortality rate of HCC in China was 37.55 and 14.45 per 100,000" .. What is the exact rate? Should it be only one number? 3. "HCC often stems from hepatitis B cirrhosis and combines with portal hypertension [2], such as the digestive tract hemorrhage and/or refractory ascites (or hydrothorax) [8, 9]; Patients with portal hypertension symptoms often have no opportunity to receive radical surgery or liver transplantation, even for interventional treatments, which adds importance to the treatment of portal hypertension symptoms that becomes urgent and core problem on that occasion" .. These sentences are quite redundant and



## BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

---

contain lots of errors, for example the symbol “;”. 4. The next sentence in the introduction is very long. It should be summarized. And the rest part of the introduction should be corrected as well. 5. In the introduction, simple should be written as sample. 6. The authors included 209 of 261 patients for analysis. Why did the authors choose this group of population? What happened with the rest of patients? 7. In my opinion, the authors has combined the “result” of this study with the “method” part. The result (for example, characteristics of included patients, tumors, treatment received) should be placed in the “result” part of the manuscript. 8. The result of patients characteristics contain a lot of grammatical and symbol errors. 9. What were the indications for TIPS placement? It should be clearly stated. 10. Why did the authors choose 5 years as a cutoff point for prognosis determination? 11. The first part of “therapeutic methods” is quite confusing. What is the main objective of this paragraph, to explain how to do the procedure or the describe how did the included patients receive the procedure? This should be rewritten. 12. What is the meaning of “1-11 times for each case.”? 13. The figure legend should be placed at the lase part of the text. And hepatitis c should be written as C. There are some spelling and symbol errors in the figure legend as well. 14. What is the meaning of “the end of death”? 15. The “follow up” should be rewritten and proofread by persons with experience in academic English writing. 16. What was the main objective of this study? It should be firstly described in the result part. 17. The pre-TIPS PSG was very low (3.87). I am surprised that this low pressure gradient could cause the symptoms of portal hypertension. 18. What was the unit of pressure gradient that the authors measured? Normally, we use mmHg. 19. The part 3 of the result should be rewritten. The authors should points out the important point from the analysis in the text. And, in my opinion, it is not necessary to report the survival and restenosis every year from 1-5. Again, there are symbol errors. 20. In the last part of the result, the authors should state the important and main finding of their study in the proper and universal pattern. Did the authors perform regression analysis of their data? The detailes causes of death should be explained. 21. Unfortunately, I don’t understand the main idea, including the result, of this manuscript very well. Therefore, I couldn’t make a comment on the discussion part right now. I would suggest the authors to revise the manuscript first and send it back for second revision. However, a lots of grammatical and symbol errors are n