

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 33351

Title: Definition of colorectal anastomotic leakage: consensus survey among Dutch and Chinese colorectal surgeons

Reviewer's code: 03475726

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Jing Yu

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 checked="" 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 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

This is an interesting study which focuses on an important topic for surgical literature as the definition of anastomotic leak in colorectal surgery. The study is well written and the analysis of data is well conducted, as well as the discussion of the results. I have some comments, which I report below. MAJOR comment There might be a bias in the selection of surgeons interviewed. In The Netherlands, 141 surgeons from the Taskforce of Coloproctology of the Dutch Society of Gastrointestinal surgery were invited. This suggest that these surgeons might be highly specialized colorectal surgeons with academic interest, potentially engaged in writing national guidelines and perhaps good readers of the scientific literature. On the other side, an unknown number of Chinese surgeons was invited and the first 200 replies were considered (rather than considering all replies in an a given time interval). These surgeons were registered as gastrointestinal surgeons, which not necessarily implies they are specialized in colorectal surgery (they might be upper gi surgeons or even hpb surgeons). The two populations of



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

surgeons should be presented according to: - Their background (academic OR not academic) - Number of colorectal procedures performed annually - Their attitude to read scientific literature. All these three characteristic might strongly influence their responses to the questionnaire. If the two populations are not comparable, so their answers are not comparable. Please, if you have, provide information about this pivotal point. MINOR comments: - The invitation letter and instructions to fill the questionnaire should be included in the supplementary materials - With regards to clinical manifestations predictive of CAL, the use of parameters derived from the Dutch Leakage Score might have led to reach a greater agreement between Dutch surgeons compared to Chinese colleagues - The fact that 40% of Chinese surgeons interviewed expressed disagreement about high levels of CRP as predictive of CAL is indeed interesting. This might be the spy of different usage of this laboratory test and this question should have been preceded by the question: Do you routinely use CRP?

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 33351

Title: Definition of colorectal anastomotic leakage: consensus survey among Dutch and Chinese colorectal surgeons

Reviewer's code: 03647716

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Jing Yu

Date sent for review: 2017-02-08

Date reviewed: 2017-02-18

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 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

This is an interesting manuscript. However "state of art" in corrent leteature should be discussed. Furthemore, being involved dutch and cinese surgeons, the manuacript had to be focused on a comparison between east and west; in the title a sentence "east versus west" could be included.