PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Meta-Analysis

Manuscript NO: 47817

Title: Scoring criteria for determining the safety of liver resection for malignant liver tumors

Reviewer's code: 01806467

Reviewer's country: South Korea

Science editor: Ying Dou

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-03-27 02:32

Reviewer performed review: 2019-03-30 08:57

Review time: 3 Days and 6 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	[ ] Accept (High priority)	Peer-Review:
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] Accept (General priority)	[Y] Anonymous
[Y] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Minor revision	[ ] Onymous
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejection	[Y] Major revision	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
[ ] Grade E: Do not publish		[ ] Rejection	[ ] Advanced
			[Y] General
			[ ] No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			[ ] Yes
			[Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I read your article with a great interest. While this is a valuable systematic review, it leaves some issues that remain to be addressed. 1) It is hard to understand why the authors include terms like "food", "food, formulated", OR "formulated food" as a

searching strategy for the PubMed database. Did the authors intend to include all the words related to the "formula"? For a systematic review, I would rather recommend to the authors to include all the relevant literature by searching with diverse terms such as formula, method, and calculation. 2) Somehow I can not find the paper about the Sapporo score that the authors presented. The reference number of the paper is 20; "Harada K, Mizuguchi T, Kawamoto M, Meguro M, Ota S, Sasaki S, Miyanishi K, Hatakenaka M, Shinomura Y, Kato J, Hirata K. Prediction of postoperative liver failure and evaluation of modified criteria for liver resection with computed volume analysis. Hepatogastroenterology 2014; In press". Is the paper published elsewhere? 3) It would be better to compare the predictive performance of the Sapporo scoring system in predicting liver dysfunction after liver resection to that of the MELD score or Child Pugh score which is widely used in predicting liver function. 4) The intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC) presented by authors can only have values between 0 and 1. However, in a study included in the third group of SLV value measurements, the ICC value was found to be -0.39, and it is necessary to confirm whether the value is correct. 5) If the measured values of the research group are all high and the range is small, the interpersonal variability is relatively small and the ICC is low compared to the intra-individual variation (error). Since the characteristics of the sample are reflected in this way, it is difficult to compare the ICC of different study groups. The authors classified the studies estimating SLVs into 3 groups according to the variables included in the studies, and compare the ICCs between the groups, which is a meaningless comparison.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

BPG Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Meta-Analysis

Manuscript NO: 47817

Title: Scoring criteria for determining the safety of liver resection for malignant liver tumors

Reviewer's code: 03538691

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Ying Dou

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-03-28 09:44

Reviewer performed review: 2019-04-10 03:38

Review time: 12 Days and 17 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	[ ] Accept (High priority)	Peer-Review:
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] Accept (General priority)	[Y] Anonymous
[ ] Grade C: Good	[Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Minor revision	[ ] Onymous
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejection	[ ] Major revision	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
[Y] Grade E: Do not publish		[Y] Rejection	[ ] Advanced
			[Y] General
			[ ] No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			[ ] Yes
			[Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1【AIMS To review previously reported SLV formulae and the methods used to evaluate the minimum RLV, and explore the association between liver volume and mortality.】 The authors wanted to study the relationship between liver volume and mortality, but

no mortality data were found in the content including results and discussion. 2【CONCLUSION We reviewed SLV formulae and the minimum RLV required for safe liver resection. The Sapporo score is the only liver function-based method for determining the minimum RLV.】 Does the author suggest that Sapporo score is the best? What is the relationship of Sapporo score with mortality? 3【SLV (ml)=822.7×body surface area [BSA]−183.2 (R2=0.419 and R=0.644, P <0.001).】 Not easy to calculate body surface area! It is not as convenient as weight. 4【The results of the linear regression analysis of the relationship between total liver volume and body surface area (BSA) are shown in Fig. 1】 How to measure body surface area (BSA) clinically? 5【According to the Sapporo score, the RLV cut-off values ranged from 35–95%】 35–95%？ The range is too extensive. 6【Furthermore, we found that the minimum RLV required for a safe hepatectomy ranged from 25–50% depending on the pathological background. 】 Pathological background? Does the author have a pathological background? What are the concrete contents? Tumor grade and differentiation？   7【The Sapporo score is the only liver function-based method for determining the minimum RLV.】 Does Sapporo score have a pathological background? 8【and the use of other simpler models does not result in markedly different outcomes】 The word different maybe replaced by "favourable". 9【In fact, all of the previously reported models exhibited similar ICC. 】 This sentence is illogical, rewrite it. 10【The question is how we could evaluate liver damage before surgery.】 This is the theme of this article! But the author's conclusions are not relevant to the theme. 11【Sapporo score is still the only method for evaluating liver function】 Is there any difference between the author's method and Sapporo score？ 12【Therefore, evaluations of liver function should take both biochemical and anatomical findings into account.】 What are anatomical findings？ 13【CONCLUSIONS】 There is no definite conclusion! 14【Although several SLV formulae have been presented, we created two

simple SLV formulae that could be applied to the clinical setting.】 SLV and RLV, which is more important in evaluating hepatectomy？ 15【Sapporo score is the only liver function-based method for estimating the minimum RLV】 Sapporo score, author's methods; Which one is better？ 16【A multi-center clinical study is currently ongoing to determine whether the Sapporo score is useful for predicting liver failure and the complications of hepatectomy with and without biliary reconstruction.】 Is Sapporo score the best？ 17 Figure 1. Pictures overlapped.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

[ ] The same title

[ ] Duplicate publication

[ ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

BPG Search:

[ ] The same title

[ ] Duplicate publication

[ ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Meta-Analysis

Manuscript NO: 47817

Title: Scoring criteria for determining the safety of liver resection for malignant liver tumors

Reviewer's code: 00505584

Reviewer's country: France

Science editor: Ying Dou

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-03-26 09:09

Reviewer performed review: 2019-04-19 13:30

Review time: 24 Days and 4 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
[Y] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	[ ] Accept (High priority)	Peer-Review:
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[Y] Accept (General priority)	[Y] Anonymous
[ ] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Minor revision	[ ] Onymous
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejection	[ ] Major revision	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
[ ] Grade E: Do not publish		[ ] Rejection	[Y] Advanced
			[ ] General
			[ ] No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			[ ] Yes
			[Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting and well-written article describing the clinical relevance of a formula and scoring system developed to determine the minimal residual liver volume post-hepatectomy in patients undergoing surgery for hepatic malignancy. The paper is a

bit complex to decipher and I believe that it may be helpful to give the reader an actual example of an actual clinical utilization of this formula and scoring system.   I was unfortunately unable to view all of the Figures as they are overlapped on the file that I have, perhaps if I could see them the above would not be necessary. Due to the complexity of the data discussed it would be ideal if I could have access to these figures. Regardless, I believe that due to the high quality of the work that I can read in the body of the manuscript that I will ultimately recommend that this paper be published.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

BPG Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No