

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

Manuscript NO: 46370

Title: Single incision laparoscopic fundoplication: A systematic review of the literature

Reviewer's code: 02444978

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2019-02-11

Date reviewed: 2019-02-19

Review time: 6 Hours, 8 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input 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 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 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 type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Although the results of this review seems poor, do not permitting, on the basis of the current literature, to settle the question whether single incision fundoplication is a preferable alternative to the conventional laparoscopic approach, this review has the merit of discussing all the possible variables that can influence the final result. I have

only some minor revisions to suggest: In the section “Eligibility Criteria”, the criteria to establish which outcomes are considered of interest should be specified. When comparing data (e.g. times of intervention, length of hospital stay), all the data useful for a statistical analysis should be reported, for example: standard deviation, interval between minimum and maximum value, statistical significance, etc. Some results are reported in the Discussion instead of in the Results section: this generates a bit of confusion; if they are taken from literature, the source should be mentioned. A few typos and very little linguistic revisions are present. For example, in the sentence (see Discussion) “the respective minimal invasive application prerequisites the possession of advanced skills”, “prerequisites” does means “requires”?

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 Gastrointestinal Surgery

Manuscript NO: 46370

Title: Single incision laparoscopic fundoplication: A systematic review of the literature

Reviewer's code: 03028174

Reviewer's country: Thailand

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2019-02-11

Date reviewed: 2019-02-21

Review time: 2 Hours, 10 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" 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 article is aimed to provide a current overview of the technical variations and the postoperative outcomes of patients submitted to single incision fundoplication. The title is "Single incision laparoscopic fundoplication: a systematic review of the literature".

1. This is a systematic review. 2. Please add the limitations of the study in the



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

discussion section. 3. What are the new knowledges from this study? 4. Finally, please recommend the readers “How to apply this knowledge for routine clinical practice?”.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

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

BPG Search:

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