

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 30940

Title: Minimally versus conventional invasive techniques for grafts harvested for living donor liver transplantation: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Reviewer's code: 00053888

Reviewer's country: United Kingdom

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2016-12-09

Date reviewed: 2016-12-09

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

The authors have presented a meta analysis of studies that compare minimally invasive and conventional living liver donation. The studies included are a mixed bag and include some laparoscopic, some true laparoscopic assisted and some partly laparoscopic with a subsequent midline incision. None of these studies were randomised but had retrospective control groups of open LRLD. The authors do however acknowledge that this weakens their data. the manuscript is well written with a few grammatical & spelling errors. It is encouraging to see that the authors have not exaggerated their conclusions and overall I believe that the manuscript is worthy of publication.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 30940

Title: Minimally versus conventional invasive techniques for grafts harvested for living donor liver transplantation: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Reviewer's code: 00054794

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2016-12-09

Date reviewed: 2016-12-27

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

Thank you for the opportunity to review the manuscript entitled, "Minimally versus conventional invasive techniques for grafts harvested for living donor liver transplantation: A systematic review and meta-analysis." Li H et al. showed that minimally invasive procedures are safe, effective, and feasible for living donor liver resection. I think that overall a very interesting manuscript for an efficacy of minimally invasive living donor hepatectomy. However, the manuscript could benefit from revision if the manuscript is revised. Firstly, I think that a surgical approach of upper midline incision length >15 cm in a left-side living donor hepatectomy is unlikely at present. Therefore, all of the left-side living donor hepatectomy is classified as minimally invasive procedures, and the analysis of left-side living donor hepatectomy is meaningless. I think that the analysis of right-side living donor hepatectomy is sufficient to demonstrate an efficacy of minimally invasive living donor hepatectomy. In addition, it



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

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

is difficult to understand its efficacy because of too long manuscript. Secondly, it is necessary to distinguish between early (1990 's(or -2010's)) and late (2000 's-(or 2010's-)) periods. The progress of surgical procedures is different between early (1990 's(or -2010's)) and late (2000 's-(or 2010's-)) periods. I think that it is not suitable to analyze the study including both early (1990 's(or -2010's)) and late (2000 's-(or 2010's-)) periods.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 30940

Title: Minimally versus conventional invasive techniques for grafts harvested for living donor liver transplantation: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Reviewer's code: 00058443

Reviewer's country: Taiwan

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2016-12-09

Date reviewed: 2016-12-31

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

1. The study show less post-operative complications of donor in MILDH group compared with CLDH. Please describe and discuss why the biliary and vascular complications were less. 2. Regarding to the complications of donor in each group, it is important to describe in detail even few patients. The reason in each group should be described separately and how to prevent ,especial in MILDH group 3. In living donor hepatectomy, the biliary tree manipulation and identification are the key impacts to the functions of graft. The different dissection methods between two groups were also concerned. Please describe the biliary complication in the recipients of each group. The ratio of biliary stenosis is important and it should be compared. 4. In the result, there are too many figures to describe just simple event. Please try to use the simple way to show the result. 5. For the subgroup analysis, the result and discussion are not coordinated. The result show the operative time is shorter in CLDH (for left hepatectomy) but the discussion described the operative time is similar in these two groups. What is true? In



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

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

the discussion, please explain why operative time in left hepatectomy is shorter in CLDH.