

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Surgical Procedures

Manuscript NO: 41062

Title: Short Insight. Peer Review.

Reviewer's code: 02948135

Reviewer's country: United Kingdom

Science editor: Li-Jun Cui

Date sent for review: 2018-07-23

Date reviewed: 2018-07-23

Review time: 19 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a very good paper on this hot issue. I have the following comments: 1.The paper will benefit from removing the basic facts , such as the last paragraph in introduction and the table at the end of the paper.[the journey of paper], 2.The authors have discussed many important issues m, however the followings are also should be included:



**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

1.The editor in chief term of service: some journals have editor in chief for long period of time and sometime a person who is more than 80 years old. Although we all respect our colleagues and professor but also equally important aging process is affecting the mental power /decision and therefore to be fair the editor in chief term should be limited. We can't expect progress if the same editor make final decision for last 15 -20 years ! 2.The research which is conducted by certain names, institutions, countries will have different treatment of the one that is not ! The call for robust criteria to follow in assessing any research is mandatory to avoid bias.Such criteria are not difficult to reach and actually some journals ask for specific features to look at in any submitted paper. 3. Society /association leading force: some of the work did not see the light or considered as the enemy to fight because it is challenging the society /association view.As an example what happened with Dr Rutledge[the inventor of MGB operation] in USA. After 21 years ,the ASMBS just published an opinion about the MGB operation ,there is no explanation to that apart from leading force bias. 4.Selection of the editorial board members and assignment of the received paper to a specific expert person would help to produced and complete unbiased assessment. 5.The reviewers and editorial board members are busy professionals, some of the journals abusing their time while making money from publishing papers .That is of course affecting the quality of reviewing process.If the reviewers and editorial board members feel that they are rewarded fro the work and time they are putting in each research paper review, then one would expect a high standard review.

Answer:

1. Q: "The paper will benefit from removing the basic facts , such as the last paragraph in introduction and the table at the end of the paper.[the journey of paper]"

- a. A: We appreciated this advice. It made the paper stronger. Therefore, we removed the basic facts , such as the last paragraph in introduction and the table at the end of the paper [the journey of paper].
2. “The authors have discussed many important issues m, however the followings are also should be included:”
 - a. Q: “1.The editor in chief term of service: some journals have editor in chief for long period of time and sometime a person who is more than 80 years old. Although we all respect our colleagues and professor but also equally important aging process is affecting the mental power /decision and therefore to be fair the editor in chief term should be limited. We can't expect progress if the same editor make final decision for last 15 -20 years !”
 - i. A: We enjoyed this very pertinent necessary suggestion. We included ‘The editor in chief term of service’ commentary as we believe this is a novel issue to speak about and pinpoint directly how it biases peer review. We did not include the age-specific example leading to cognitive delays, however we did address the issue that having an editor-in-chief in power for multiple decades will bias the publications in that journal for multiple decades.
 - b. Q: “2.The research which is conducted by certain names, institutions, countries will have different treatment of the one that is not ! The call for robust criteria to follow in assessing any research is mandatory to avoid bias.Such criteria are not difficult to reach and actually some journals ask for specific features to look at in any submitted paper.”
 - i. A: We liked the reviewers commentary regarding ‘robust criteria’ and included this in the paper, along with the bias to certain

research names, institutions, and countries. We included this commentary as we feel it is novel and insight the manuscript can offer to the public.

c. Q: "3. Society /association leading force: some of the work did not see the light or considered as the enemy to fight because it is challenging the society /association view.As an example what happened with Dr Rutledge[the inventor of MGB operation] in USA. After 21 years ,the ASMBS just published an opinion about the MGB operation ,there is no explanation to that apart from leading force bias."

i. A: We included the reviewer's commentary on the society/association leading force because we feel that this is another great topic that strengthens our stance on bias.

d. Q: "4.Selection of the editorial board members and assignment of the received paper to a specific expert person would help to produced and complete unbiased assessment."

i. A: We included and expanded upon this commentary as we feel that this is a novel idea that offers insight on potential solutions to fix issues related to bias.

e. Q: "5.The reviewers and editorial board members are busy professionals, some of the journals abusing their time while making money from publishing papers .That is of course affecting the quality of reviewing process.If the reviewers and editorial board members feel that they are rewarded fro the work and time they are putting in each research paper review, then one would expect a high standard review."

i. A: We really liked the reviewers commentary on how reviewers need to be valued and should receive compensation for their work.



**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

We believe this is a novel solution that will result in a higher standard review.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Surgical Procedures

Manuscript NO: 41062

Title: Short Insight. Peer Review.

Reviewer's code: 01047625

Reviewer's country: Taiwan

Science editor: Li-Jun Cui

Date sent for review: 2018-07-23

Date reviewed: 2018-07-30

Review time: 7 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The editorial written by Neil D. Joshi et al. introduces the peer reviewing process of scientific articles and may be helpful for those who try to publish articles in scientific journals. I would suggest priority publishing of this editorial.



**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

Answer:

1. Q: "The editorial written by Neil D. Joshi et al. introduces the peer reviewing process of scientific articles and may be helpful for those who try to publish articles in scientific journals. I would suggest priority publishing of this editorial."
 - a. A: Thank you.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Surgical Procedures

Manuscript NO: 41062

Title: Short Insight. Peer Review.

Reviewer's code: 00505460

Reviewer's country: Germany

Science editor: Li-Jun Cui

Date sent for review: 2018-07-23

Date reviewed: 2018-08-06

Review time: 14 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The editorial of Joshi et al. provides a balanced overview of the peer review process and discusses different approaches for the improvement of this process. The topic of this manuscript is extremely important for the scientific community and I am sure that it will attract a broad readership. The manuscript is well written and addresses many different

aspects. When read-ing, only the following points came to my mind, which may be additionally included by the authors: 1. The authors state that the “entire review process can be undermined through authors suggesting a “friendly reviewer”. I fully agree. However, it should also be mentioned that potential “friendly reviewers” are sometimes exactly the opposite. Even if the reviewers are good friends of the authors they may judge a manuscript bad, because the review process is anon-ymous. 2. Another potential risk of the peer review process is that renowned scientists accept an invitation for review, however, due to other commitments do not perform the review themselves but hand it over to their group members (which may not have the full expertise and experience). Of course, this is not acceptable and strictly forbidden by the journals. Nonetheless, it may happen quite often...

Answer:

1. Q: “The authors state that the “entire review process can be undermined through authors suggesting a “friendly reviewer”. I fully agree. However, it should also be mentioned that potential “friendly reviewers” are sometimes exactly the opposite. Even if the reviewers are good friends of the authors they may judge a manuscript bad, because the review process is anon-ymous.”
 - a. A: We enjoyed this commentary by the reviewer and were very happy to include in the manuscript as we feel it offers the flipside of a positively biased example we gave. This is in fact very true.
2. Q: “Another potential risk of the peer review process is that renowned scientists accept an invitation for review, however, due to other commitments do not perform the review themselves but hand it over to their group members (which may not have the full expertise and experience). Of course, this is not acceptable and strictly forbidden by the journals. Nonetheless, it may happen quite often...”



**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

- a. A: We included this commentary provided by the reviewer as we feel it is novel and a suggestion that strengthens the manuscript.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No