

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568 **E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com https://www.wjgnet.com

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

Manuscript NO: 82246

Title: Ligamentum teres hepatis as a graft for portal and/or superior mesenteric vein

reconstruction: from bench to bedside

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05322119 **Position:** Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: FACS, MD

Professional title: Surgical Oncologist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Peru

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-12

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-12-12 13:51

Reviewer performed review: 2022-12-21 13:07

Review time: 8 Days and 23 Hours

Scientific quality	[Y] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish	
Language quality	[] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection	
Conclusion	[] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection	
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No	



Baishideng **Publishing**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

Peer-Review: [] Anonymous [Y] Onymous Peer-reviewer statements Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you for the opportunity to review this paper. It has a good quality and provides an insightful description of an interesting graft for pv/smv reconstruction after PD. Kindly find my questions below: 1. In the manuscript, many continuous variables are reported as means with standard deviation. I suggest as this is a small study to report medians and interquartile ranges. 2. In the mortality section, two cases are reported. I consider that the exact causes should be addressed for each patient. 3. How many pancreaticoduodenectomies are performed in your center, and what is the rate of vascular resections? Of them, how many patients represent your cohort? 4. What crtieria did you use to state a moderate stenosis? 5. What does "t" represent in table 2? 6. How do you decide if a patient requires pv/smv resection? Again I consider the paper relevant and I want to commend the authors for their interesting work. Kind regards.



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568 **E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com https://www.wjgnet.com

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

Manuscript NO: 82246

Title: Ligamentum teres hepatis as a graft for portal and/or superior mesenteric vein

reconstruction: from bench to bedside

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 00183279 Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: FRCS (Ed), MD, MS

Professional title: Dean, Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-12

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-12-27 03:57

Reviewer performed review: 2023-01-08 10:30

Review time: 12 Days and 6 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good
	[] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No creativity or innovation



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568 **E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[] Grade A: Priority publishing [] Grade B: Minor language polishing [Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [] Major revision [Y] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [] Anonymous [Y] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Surgeons have gradually pushed the boundaries in surgical resection thanks to the advancements in oncology and critical care. With the advancement of vascular anastomosis techniques in recent years, radical surgery for tumors combined with venous vascular resection and reconstruction has been widely used . For vascular replacement materials that can be used for reconstruction are autologous veins, parietal peritoneum, also falciform ligament, artificial blood vessels and allogeneic blood vesselsS. Autologous vessels are less used than the Allogeneic grafts who have the advantages of avaliblity, good matching of caliber, and ideal histocompatibility. This study has been performed for evaluating PV/SMV reconstruction using autologous ligamentum teres hepatis graft in pancreaticobiliary malignancy patients Twenty-six patients have undergone Pancreaticoduodenectomy combined with PV and/or SMV resection and reconstruction using recanalized ligamentum teres hepatis graft and the conclusion drawn is: That ligamentum teres hepatis graft can be used as an autologous graft for PV and/or SMV reconstruction in pancreaticobiliary malignancy patients who require PV and/or SMV resection. The overall morbidity and mortality



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568 **E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

rates were 38.46% and 7.69%, respectively. There were no graft-related complications Graft stenosis rates at two weeks, one month, three months and one year were 7.69%, 11.54%, 15.38%, and 19.23%, respectively. Although a good effort by the authors, it is a small series and the conclusion drawn is well know. There seems to be no unique message. The Indications, technique and the outcome has been well studied. Im suggest the authors to carry on the study and come out with a power statement.