

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 35093

Title: Laparoscopic versus Open Hepatectomy for Hepatolithiasis: an Updated Systematic Review and Meta-analysis

Reviewer's code: 00735706

Reviewer's country: Malaysia

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2017-07-10

Date reviewed: 2017-07-15

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" 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 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 is an important paper and requires wider dissemination.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 35093

Title: Laparoscopic versus Open Hepatectomy for Hepatolithiasis: an Updated Systematic Review and Meta-analysis

Reviewer's code: 01213502

Reviewer's country: Taiwan

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2017-07-10

Date reviewed: 2017-07-19

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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		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

The authors submitted a meta-analysis article to discuss the superiority between traditional and laparoscopic hepatectomy for hepatolithiasis. I agree the methodology, results and the discussion. However, I have comment in the abstract. The authors concluded that laparoscopic approach is superior to the open approach in treating hepatolithiasis. It seemed not be suitable. I suggest "The laparoscopic approach is safe and effective, with less intraoperative estimated blood loss, fewer postoperative complications, reduced length of hospital stay and shorter intestinal function recovery time than with conventional approaches." is more suitable.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 35093

Title: Laparoscopic versus Open Hepatectomy for Hepatolithiasis: an Updated Systematic Review and Meta-analysis

Reviewer's code: 02467561

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2017-07-10

Date reviewed: 2017-07-19

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

The manuscript "Laparoscopic versus open hepatectomy for hepatolithiasis: an updated systematic review and meta-analysis" shows the results of a meta-analysis, offering a rigorous comparison of the effects of laparoscopic and open approach for the treatment of hepatolithiasis. The paper is clearly structured and the subgroup analysis contributes to make the results of this work more informative for the scientific community. At the same time, I think that some concerns should be addressed in the manuscript before acceptance for publication. Major revisions: The quality of retrieved retrospective studies was analyzed through the modified Newcastle-Ottawa scale and studies with score ≥ 7 were defined as high quality. The authors should better explain how this cut-off value was determined - if autonomously or according to the existing literature -.

In the discussion section, when the results of the two approaches are described, it is stated that some issues related to the laparoscopic approach (surgeons' experience, dissimilarity of operating procedures) may have affected the results. Please clarify the



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>

evidence supporting this conclusion. Minor revisions: Although the question/issue is debated, or even pedantic, and it does not appear to be a scientific standard in literature, I should suggest to write the letter P of 'p-value' with no capitalization in the text (fourth paragraph in "Materials and Methods" and below).