

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

Manuscript NO: 32927

Title: Robot-assisted laparoscopic vs open gastrectomy for gastric cancer: Systematic review and meta-analysis

Reviewer's code: 00227386

Reviewer's country: United Kingdom

Science editor: Xiu-Xia Song

Date sent for review: 2017-02-08

Date reviewed: 2017-02-09

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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input 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 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 type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This paper is a meta-analysis of 6 reports comparing the outcomes of robot-assisted laparoscopic gastrectomy for early gastric cancer with open gastrectomy, with favourable results for the former group. The information is important and needs to be made known. It is well written needing just a few spelling corrections. The Discussion contains some repetition and could be shortened. The results are clearly presented in the Tables. Figures 2,3 and 4 are very detailed and might be considered more suitable for a statistical journal. The information in these Figures is already included in the text and they possibly could be omitted.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

Manuscript NO: 32927

Title: Robot-assisted laparoscopic vs open gastrectomy for gastric cancer: Systematic review and meta-analysis

Reviewer's code: 02441038

Reviewer's country: Poland

Science editor: Xiu-Xia Song

Date sent for review: 2017-02-08

Date reviewed: 2017-02-15

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input 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

This study has very good methodology in terms of selecting, checking and analyzing studies about RAG vs OG. Authors discuss also a weak point which is only one randomized study and heterogeneity of patients populations. Some minor language corrections are needed

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

Manuscript NO: 32927

Title: Robot-assisted laparoscopic vs open gastrectomy for gastric cancer: Systematic review and meta-analysis

Reviewer's code: 03036051

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Xiu-Xia Song

Date sent for review: 2017-02-08

Date reviewed: 2017-02-17

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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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

This meta analysis compared the short-term outcomes of gastric cancer patients between robotic assisted gastrectomy (RAG) and open gastrectomy. The results demonstrated RAG was safe and feasible. But the language of manuscript need to be polished.