



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

**Manuscript NO:** 88095

**Title:** The impact of open hepatectomy on postoperative bile leakage in patients with biliary tract cancer

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 07747317

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Assistant Professor, Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Japan

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-10-26

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-10-30 08:15

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-11-07 09:21

**Review time:** 8 Days and 1 Hour

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Novelty of this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
<b>Creativity or innovation of this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation



<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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**

Bile leak is a common and serious complication of hepatectomy for biliary tract cancer that can cause significant morbidity and mortality. The authors conducted this retrospective study to explore the impact of open hepatectomy on postoperative bile leakage in patients with biliary tract cancer. This helps optimize management strategies and reduce the occurrence of bile leak. However, there are still some minor issues to be noted in the article, such as incomplete data in Table 1: Tumor size (cm) is 6.3 ±? The last sentence of the Data collection and analysis section: Statistical significance was set at p



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

**Manuscript NO:** 88095

**Title:** The impact of open hepatectomy on postoperative bile leakage in patients with biliary tract cancer

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 07746694

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Assistant Professor, Lecturer

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** United Kingdom

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-10-26

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-10-27 09:20

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-11-07 10:15

**Review time:** 11 Days

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Novelty of this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
<b>Creativity or innovation of this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation



<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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**

Wu G et al. analyzed 120 patients who underwent open hepatectomy for biliary tract cancer and found that the risk factors for bile leakage were male sex, hepatocellular carcinoma, major hepatectomy, blood loss, and blood transfusion. It is well written and highly interesting. The study is well designed and presented with optimal analysis, discussion, tabulation and graphic display of data. Thank you for giving opportunity to review this study. Furthermore, minor comment that I would to proposed: 1. Title: Proper and cover all the core result from the study. 2. Abstract: Address all of the important component from the study. 3. Key words: could cover this study. 4. Introduction: Describe the overall basic knowledge for this study. Moreover, the aim of the study is clear. 5. Method: The present study is methodologically well conducted. 6. Results: The result of this study is of interest. However, the presentation of results in tables is too simple, and the header of Tables 1-4 are the same. It is suggested to re-check and modify them. 7. Discussion: The manuscript clearly interprets the finding adequately and appropriately. In addition, the manuscript could highlight the key points clearly. It is recommended to add a discussion of the limitations of the study to the



# Baishideng Publishing Group

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

**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568

**E-mail:** [office@baishideng.com](mailto:office@baishideng.com)

**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](http://www.wjgnet.com)

discussion section.