

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

Manuscript NO: 64088

Title: Robotic Donor Hepatectomy: Are We There Yet?

Reviewer's code: 03668558

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Consultant Physician-Scientist, Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: India

Manuscript submission date: 2021-02-08

Reviewer chosen by: Ya-Juan Ma

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-02-10 17:43

Reviewer performed review: 2021-02-18 09:01

Review time: 7 Days and 15 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This review by Drs. Rammohan and Rela describes progress on minimally invasive donor hepatectomy in the field of living donor liver transplantation. Morbidity and mortality of the living donor represent major issues in the clinical practice. The Authors summarize the available evidence on minimally invasive donor hepatectomy, highlighting strengths and pitfalls. In detail, as mentioned by the Authors, the learning curve, a possible prolongation of ischemia time and the absence of comparative studies between open and minimally invasive donor hepatectomy have to be taken into account. I have few comments: - what does CUSA stand for? - what is the pre-operative assessment before MI LDH? Any difference with ODH? - I suggest to add a table summarizing current strengths and pitfalls of MI LDH. - I suggest to better explain the following sentence: "The robotic platform was introduced to aid and flatten the learning curve of MIS". - A comment about LDLT may be important. LDLT has been described for patients with HCC or patients with ACLF. What could be the ideal setting for MI DH? Moreover, as mentioned by the Authors, MI DH may be performed only by expert laparoscopic surgeons and dedicated nurse team, with specific re-organization of team work and facilities. - I suggest to mention the recently consensus doi: 10.1097/TP.0000000000003680. - I wonder if the title "Minimally invasive donor hepatectomy" may fit better.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

Manuscript NO: 64088

Title: Robotic Donor Hepatectomy: Are We There Yet?

Reviewer's code: 03668558

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Consultant Physician-Scientist, Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: India

Manuscript submission date: 2021-02-08

Reviewer chosen by: Man Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-04-12 16:44

Reviewer performed review: 2021-04-12 16:51

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The Authors have fairly answered my previous comments. In my opinion, the

manuscript has been improved after the Authors' revision. I think that the Table the Authors added may be informative, especially for non-expert readers. I do not have any further comment.