



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology  
**Manuscript NO:** 36597  
**Title:** Clinical Advantages of Single Port Laparoscopic Hepatectomy  
**Reviewer’s code:** 02551692  
**Reviewer’s country:** Italy  
**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma  
**Date sent for review:** 2017-10-10  
**Date reviewed:** 2017-10-19  
**Review time:** 9 Days

| 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 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 checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism            | <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor            |   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No         | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision                |
|   |   | BPG Search:                                    |  |
|   |   | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title        |  |
|   |   | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication |  |
|   |   | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism            |  |
|   |   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No         |  |

**COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Clinical Advantages of Single Port Laparoscopic Hepatectomy (Retrospective Study)  
 Whether it is an interesting study, there are some important issues which have to be addressed: 1) The number of patients recruited is acceptable considering: the single center and the reference period 2) Surgical technique is more difficult than Multi Port Laparoscopic Hepatectomy, but it is used efficiently for benign and malignant diseases. 3) A limitation of the surgical technique is that it is necessary a good experience with Single Port technique and the learning curve is longer. 4) An expert surgeon can perform hepatectomy with this technique in less time, with lower blood loss and generally with lower intraoperative and postoperative complications. 5) There is a shorter length of stay with Single Port Laparoscopic technique. 6) An expert surgeon can also perform hepatectomy with this technique in malignant diseases, with good safety margins of resection; in literature this technique is performed only for benign diseases. 7) The



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,  
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](http://www.wjgnet.com)

study is well conducted and English is of a good standard. 8) There are no other studies with this technique; in literature there are only case reports, meta-analysis, mini-reviews and few studies with a limited number of patients (generally <40 patients), especially about benign diseases.



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology  
**Manuscript NO:** 36597  
**Title:** Clinical Advantages of Single Port Laparoscopic Hepatectomy  
**Reviewer’s code:** 00183086  
**Reviewer’s country:** Greece  
**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma  
**Date sent for review:** 2017-10-21  
**Date reviewed:** 2017-10-21  
**Review time:** 6 Hours

| 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good | <input 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 type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism            | <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor      |  | <input type="checkbox"/> No                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision                |
|   |  | BPG Search:                                    |  |
|   |  | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title        |  |
|   |  | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication |  |
|   |  | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism            |  |
|   |  | <input type="checkbox"/> No                    |  |

**COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

This is a very interesting article with regard to potential Clinical Advantages of Single Port Laparoscopic Hepatectomy. Nevertheless, several limitations have been raised and major revisions are required. 1. In the Introduction section the Number of paragraphs should be reduced. Previously published Information should be avoided. On the contrary, single-port laparoscopic hepatectomy and relevant indications should be more analysed. 2. In the Methods section inclusion and exclusion criteria should be more clear. Additional demographic data with regard to the two groups of patients are missing. The Information of surgical technique should be more impact. 3. In the Results section data including in the Tables should be excluded. The main conclusion of the study is not apparent. 4. The Discussion is too narrative. Comparative analysis of recently published data is missing. The final conclusion could be incorporated in the Discussion section. 5. The Number of Tables should be reduced.



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,  
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 36597

**Title:** Clinical Advantages of Single Port Laparoscopic Hepatectomy

**Reviewer's code:** 03003330

**Reviewer's country:** Japan

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2017-10-21

**Date reviewed:** 2017-10-22

**Review time:** 1 Day

| 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good | <input 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 type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism            | <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor      |  | <input type="checkbox"/> No                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision                |
|   |  | BPG Search:                                    |  |
|   |  | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title        |  |
|   |  | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication |  |
|   |  | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism            |  |
|   |  | <input type="checkbox"/> No                    |  |

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This manuscript focusing the clinical advantage of single port laparoscopic hepatectomy (Lap-H) is an interesting study, but there are some important issues which have to be addressed. 1 It is well known that the technical difficulty of of Lap-H depends on the tumor location in the liver. In this series, the frequency of partial resection of the liver was clearly higher in single port Lap-H than that in multi port Lap-H. This may be caused by the defference of tumor distribution in the liver and patioents' selection between 2 groups. Authors should demonstrate the tumor distribuion in each groups. 2 The rate of morbidities including conversion rate to open surgery seems to high. Authors should make comparisons to previous major reports from larage centers and describe it in discussion.



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,  
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 36597

**Title:** Clinical Advantages of Single Port Laparoscopic Hepatectomy

**Reviewer's code:** 02944278

**Reviewer's country:** Italy

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2017-10-21

**Date reviewed:** 2017-10-23

**Review time:** 2 Days

| CLASSIFICATION   | LANGUAGE EVALUATION  | SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT                          | CONCLUSION   |
|--|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing     | Google Search:                                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept             |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good | <input 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 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

Extremely interesting paper, who shows how minimally invasive approach are valid solution for liver surgery. Results are a little bit surprising, considering single trocar faster than multi trocar surgery. Nice comparison among both techniques regarding left hepatectomies. Nice paper, well written