



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

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

**Manuscript NO:** 38753

**Title:** Comparison between uncut Roux-en-Y and Roux-en-Y reconstruction after distal gastrectomy for gastric cancer: A meta-analysis

**Reviewer’s code:** 02546253

**Reviewer’s country:** Japan

**Science editor:** Xue-Jiao Wang

**Date sent for review:** 2018-03-13

**Date reviewed:** 2018-03-18

**Review time:** 5 Days

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**

1) This meta-analysis includes the reports in which distal gastrectomy and reconstruction were performed with laparoscopic surgery. Laparoscopic surgery contributes to decreasing various complications. But the author did not assess and discuss about the influence of laparoscopic surgery on the conclusions. I think you should analyze it or discuss about it in “Discussion” session. 2) The definitions of each complication are vague. The results and conclusions mostly depend on these definitions. Therefore, the authors should clarify the each definition in all reports included in this meta-analysis. Moreover, the authors should discuss about how much the difference of these definitions of each complication affect the conclusions.



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

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

**Manuscript NO:** 38753

**Title:** Comparison between uncut Roux-en-Y and Roux-en-Y reconstruction after distal gastrectomy for gastric cancer: A meta-analysis

**Reviewer’s code:** 03508701

**Reviewer’s country:** China

**Science editor:** Xue-Jiao Wang

**Date sent for review:** 2018-03-14

**Date reviewed:** 2018-03-19

**Review time:** 5 Days

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**

Uncut Roux-en-Y reconstruction is indeed a hot topic. The major concern for present study is that, the enrolled studies for pooled analysis is of low quality. So the pooled results have bias. I suggest that the author conduct a systematic review, rather than conduct a meta-analysis.



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

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

**Manuscript NO:** 38753

**Title:** Comparison between uncut Roux-en-Y and Roux-en-Y reconstruction after distal gastrectomy for gastric cancer: A meta-analysis

**Reviewer's code:** 01588319

**Reviewer's country:** Taiwan

**Science editor:** Xue-Jiao Wang

**Date sent for review:** 2018-03-14

**Date reviewed:** 2018-03-20

**Review time:** 6 Days

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**

1. In the Figure 2, a study conducted by Park et al. had a different pattern. How the authors deal with this issue? 2. How about the assessment of "risk of bias"?