

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 16918

**Title:** Experience of 9 cases of Laparoscopic Frey Procedure for Chronic Pancreatitis and Discussion of Selective Criteria

**Reviewer's code:** 00504581

**Reviewer's country:** Spain

**Science editor:** Jing Yu

**Date sent for review:** 2015-02-05 17:50

**Date reviewed:** 2015-02-22 02:41

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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

Pros : The true interest of this original paper is the scarce number of Laparoscopic Frey procedures reported in the literature , with their difficulties and complications. Cons : the short follow up of the postsurgical evolution of patients makes difficult to compare the evolution of the patient's pain after the laparoscopic approach compared with the standard Frey open procedure or with the results published in the literature. Title: (1) Do the main and short titles accurately reflect the major topic and content of the study? This is a descriptive study showing the authors' experience with the Open and laparoscopic Frey procedure for chronic pancreatitis treatment, with an special attention to their laparoscopic approach . Therefore the title should be modified Materials and Methods: It is not clear what was the aim of the study .The aim of the study should be included in the "Methods": This study should have been designed in a different way (as a case control study, matching the "case patients" with their respective "control patients" coming from the open Frey procedure). It could have been even compared more presurgical variables and other postsurgical data such as the operative time ? and so on.. Results I miss a comparison between the results of both open DPPHR

and laparoscopic surgical procedures, not only about the different variables related with the surgery procedure but also with the pain evolution during the follow up , much more if we realized that the depth for excavation under laparoscope seems lesser that with the Open procedure. Discussion The author said in the discussion "...Someone may question the extent of excavated parenchyma of the pancreatic head.." and they try to justify it for safety reasons during the laparoscopic procedure . For this reason it would have been essential to compare during the follow up if the laparoscopic procedure achieves the same grade and percentage of pain control This sentence is incomplete (The mean preoperative Pain?? visual analogue score (VAS) of laparoscopic patients was  $7.1\pm 0.8$  (6-8),  $1.6\pm 0.8$  (1-3) at discharge,  $1.1\pm 0.9$  (0-2) after third months of follow-up. what does it mean " recovered automatically"? It would be interesting to better explain some statements like this: " So the width of pancreatic duct over 8mm was one of our criterions for laparoscopic candidates on the basis of our own experience" Why ? There are some misspelling (...stenting, stone extraction, and lithotripsy,, ... (T3) midclavicular lines, lateral,, .... and its bronches, then resect,, .. Patent 4 had) .

**COMMENTS FOR THE AUTHOR** Title: (1) Do the main and short titles accurately reflect the major topic and content of the study? This is a descriptive study showing the authors' experience with the Open and laparoscopic Frey procedure for chronic pancreatitis treatment, with an special attention to their laparoscopic approach . Therefore the title should be modified

**Materials and Methods:** It is not clear what was the aim of the study .The aim of the study should be included in the "Methods": This study should have been designed in a different way (as a case control study, matching the "case patients" with their respective "control patients" coming from the open Frey procedure). It could have been even compared more presurgical variables and other postsurgical data such as the operative time ? and so on..

**Results** I miss a comparison between the results of both open DPPHR and laparoscopic surgical procedures, not only about the different variables related with the surgery procedure but also with the pain evolution during the follow up , much more if we realized that the depth for excavation under laparoscope seems lesser that with the Open procedure.

**Discussion** The author said in the discussion "...Someone may question the extent of excavated parenchyma of the pancreatic head.." and they try to justify it for safety reasons du



**ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 16918

**Title:** Experience of 9 cases of Laparoscopic Frey Procedure for Chronic Pancreatitis and Discussion of Selective Criteria

**Reviewer's code:** 03257955

**Reviewer's country:** Denmark

**Science editor:** Jing Yu

**Date sent for review:** 2015-02-05 17:50

**Date reviewed:** 2015-04-09 03:18

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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**

The case presentation is of potential interest to the WJG reader. However, several issues need to be solved. Overall: 1) Substantial language revision is required. 2) The additional presentation of results from conventional (open) Frey procedures are of little value and should be omitted from the manuscript. 3) Also, the multiple regression to identify risk factors associated with blood loss in open surgery are poorly described in the methods section and results section. Which factors were included in the analysis and why? Again I would suggest to drop this part and focus on a detailed description of the laparoscopic cases. Abstract: Study design unclear please specify. Conclusion needs revision. Introduction: "Patients with CP can live long but anguished lives." There is a five fold increase in mortality of patients with chronic pancreatitis (Bang et al. Gastroenterology 2014). Methods: Factors included in the multiple regression must be reported. The description of the laparoscopic surgical procedure should be improved. Results: The text could be shortened as most results are already presented in the tables. Discussion: Needs language polishing and should be shortened considerably. No study to date have documented that surgery is more effective than



## 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>

---

medical therapy. Previous surgical series have compared different procedures but no control arm were included, this needs to be clarified. The "pacemaker hypothesis" of pain in chronic pancreatitis is speculative and undocumented.