



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

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

**Manuscript NO:** 48859

**Title:** Optimal timing and route of nutritional support after esophagectomy: A review of the literature

**Reviewer’s code:** 03033812

**Reviewer’s country:** Brazil

**Science editor:** Ruo-Yu Ma

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-05-10 13:06

**Reviewer performed review:** 2019-05-15 14:15

**Review time:** 5 Days and 1 Hour

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

**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Zheng et al. present a review on nutritional support after esophagectomy. The topic is interesting and has been around for decades since few questions were answered. It took me some time to review this manuscript. I had to read it several times. I figured out



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://www.wjgnet.com**

that it happened because old and new concepts are mixed up. I checked the references and noticed the same. There are new and old references. The reader will get confused or misguided in the current form. I suggest the authors to review the current standard of care, focusing on studies < 5years Minor comments: abstract needs to be reviewed in form

#### **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

##### ***Google Search:***

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

##### ***BPG Search:***

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

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

**Manuscript NO:** 48859

**Title:** Optimal timing and route of nutritional support after esophagectomy: A review of the literature

**Reviewer’s code:** 00253974

**Reviewer’s country:** Germany

**Science editor:** Ruo-Yu Ma

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-05-14 04:52

**Reviewer performed review:** 2019-06-03 20:10

**Review time:** 20 Days and 15 Hours

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

**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Interesting review, well written and easy to understand. You have addressed the Topic very well. You did a very good Point regarding the risk of anastomotic leak with early feeding that is the currently data vary by surgical technique. I’m impressed with Your



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

conclusion is comprehensible and is supported by your provided data. Once these questions are addressed, your article could be published.

#### **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

##### ***Google Search:***

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

##### ***BPG Search:***

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

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

**Manuscript NO:** 48859

**Title:** Optimal timing and route of nutritional support after esophagectomy: A review of the literature

**Reviewer’s code:** 03259574

**Reviewer’s country:** Algeria

**Science editor:** Ruo-Yu Ma

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-05-31 17:37

**Reviewer performed review:** 2019-06-05 09:52

**Review time:** 4 Days and 16 Hours

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

**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology Manuscript Type: Review Title : Optimal Timing and Route of Nutritional Support after Esophagectomy: A Review of the Literature The authors of this article tried to give an over view on the timing



# Baishideng Publishing Group

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

and routes of introducing nutrition in the postoperative setting of esophagectomy . The study is an interesting work , however , some concerns have been noted : 1- In the introduction section -it is hopeful to describe briefly the benefits of introducing a nutritional support in the postoperative setting of esophagectomy . -The purpose of the study is to discuss timing and routes of postoperative nutrition following esophagectomy , so avoid to give more details on the esophageal stent placement which is often in advanced disease . -This phrases “For clarity and transparency in interpreting the available literature, we will focus this review on the nutritional management of the post-esophagectomy patient” cited in the middle should be placed before in the end of introduction 2- In General Concepts and Historical Perspective section , It is more likely preferable to shortly describe the benefits of enteral nutrition via jejunostomy on the postoperative morbidity particularly the operative site infection, and the impact of related jejunostomy complications on the nutritional achievement . 3- This following paragraph cited in “General Concepts and Historical Perspective” section could be placed in the “Timing of feeding - Early vs Delayed “ section “Much of the debate revolves around the appropriate timing for providing postoperative enteral nutrition.<sup>9</sup> Historically, reluctance to start an oral diet after major gastrointestinal surgery generally has not been evidence-based, but instead based on fears regarding anastomotic leakage, aspiration, and inadequate nutritional intake with oral feeding.<sup>4</sup> More recent evidence suggests no advantage to a lengthy NPO period, and early initiation of feeding (within 24 hours) after gastrointestinal resections of any kind may confer a mortality benefit.<sup>13</sup> As outcomes improve and more minimally invasive esophagectomies (MIE) are performed, surgeons have begun to challenge the practice of artificial enteral feeding after esophagectomy by starting oral feeding early in the postoperative course.” 4- In Timing of Feeding – Early vs. Delayed section , The authors reported studies which demonstrated the clear benefits of the nutritional



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://www.wjgnet.com**

support via tube-jejunostomy on the nutritional and functional outcomes following esophagectomy without providing the author explanation of the obtained results and giving the limits of these studies 5- In Jejunostomy Tube Feeding section and as stated by the authors , the benefits of enteral nutrition via tube-jejunostomy is well demonstrated to achieve a good nutritional parameters after esophagectomy . However, the impact of the jejunostomy- related complications on the nutritional goals did not have been developed. Also the authors should develop the quality of enteral nutrition 6- The role of Enhanced Recovery Pathways as a section should be omitted and some studies included in this section can be appropriately used in other sections . 7- The conclusion section is too long and materials cited in the conclusion should be integrated in other sections of the manuscript . 8- The reference 1 (Biere SS, Maas KW, Cuesta MA, van der Peet, D L. Cervical or thoracic anastomosis after esophagectomy for cancer: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Digestive Surgery 2011;28:29-35.) did not show the overall morbidity of esophagectomy but assess the anastomosis location (cervical and thoracic ) regarding the morbidity and functional results , so it is inappropriately used . 9- The reference 8 ( Gerndt SJ, Orringer MB. Tube jejunostomy as an adjunct to esophagectomy. Surgery 1994;115:164.) is outdated, so it should be replaced by more recent one .

## **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

### ***Google Search:***

- [ ] The same title
- [ ] Duplicate publication
- [ ] Plagiarism
- [ Y ] No



# Baishideng Publishing Group

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA

**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242

**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243

**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)

**<https://www.wjgnet.com>**

## *BPG Search:*

The same title

Duplicate publication

Plagiarism

No



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

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

**Manuscript NO:** 48859

**Title:** Optimal timing and route of nutritional support after esophagectomy: A review of the literature

**Reviewer’s code:** 02552068

**Reviewer’s country:** Italy

**Science editor:** Ruo-Yu Ma

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-06-01 05:52

**Reviewer performed review:** 2019-06-05 17:17

**Review time:** 4 Days and 11 Hours

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

**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

The topic of the manuscript is very interesting, with many important issues that could be considered relevant for the clinical practice. The review is very updated comprehensive and exhaustive. The tables help the reader to understand many of the findings.



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

#### INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

##### *Google Search:*

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

##### *BPG Search:*

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No