



ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 20756

Title: Laparoscopic vs open partial colectomy in elderly patients: Insights from the American College of Surgeons - National Surgical Quality Improvement Program database

Reviewer's code: 00070915

Reviewer's country: Greece

Science editor: Jing Yu

Date sent for review: 2015-06-25 08:34

Date reviewed: 2015-07-17 05:21

Table with 4 columns: CLASSIFICATION, LANGUAGE EVALUATION, SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT, CONCLUSION. It contains checkboxes for various quality and misconduct criteria.

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a large database-based study comparing the outcomes of the laparoscopic and open approaches of colorectal surgery. The conception of the study is simple but the results are robust and well-backed by the rather straightforward method. I recommend publication of the study after proper response to some minor comments: Abstract - Results: ... were done with open. The word technique or approach should be added. Abstract - Conclusions: in the absence of other reasons, elderly patients... please define the reasons; this is too vague to be in the conclusions. Introduction (line 3): lower cost instead of less expensive. Introduction: "One problem with using ... two groups." This paragraph should be incorporated in the Discussion section instead of the Introduction. Discussion: the authors do not suggest reasons why surgical site infections after laparoscopic colorectal surgery are fewer than the open approach



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 20756

Title: Laparoscopic vs open partial colectomy in elderly patients: Insights from the American College of Surgeons - National Surgical Quality Improvement Program database

Reviewer's code: 03004150

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Jing Yu

Date sent for review: 2015-06-25 08:34

Date reviewed: 2015-07-20 00:57

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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This manuscript described laparoscopic colectomy for colon cancer in elderly patients using the American College of Surgeons - National Surgical Quality Improvement Program (ACS NSQIP) database. However, numerous similar reports have been published before, and this study might be questioned whether providing great significant information for current practice in treatment of patient with colon cancer or not.



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 20756

Title: Laparoscopic vs open partial colectomy in elderly patients: Insights from the American College of Surgeons - National Surgical Quality Improvement Program database

Reviewer's code: 00071753

Reviewer's country: Brazil

Science editor: Jing Yu

Date sent for review: 2015-06-25 08:34

Date reviewed: 2015-07-16 06:33

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The article performs a large review over an interesting matter in colorectal tumor resection in elderly patients and observed better results with the use of laparoscopic than open surgery approaches. There are grammar and syntax errors in the manuscript.



ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 20756

Title: Laparoscopic vs open partial colectomy in elderly patients: Insights from the American College of Surgeons - National Surgical Quality Improvement Program database

Reviewer's code: 03442149

Reviewer's country: Germany

Science editor: Jing Yu

Date sent for review: 2015-06-25 08:34

Date reviewed: 2015-07-29 14:43

Table with 4 columns: CLASSIFICATION, LANGUAGE EVALUATION, SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT, CONCLUSION. It contains checkboxes for various evaluation criteria like 'Grade A: Excellent', 'Priority publishing', 'Google Search', 'Accept', etc.

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this original article the authors analysed data of 27,604 consecutive patients older than 65 years retrospectively, which were underwent laparoscopic or open partial colectomy between 2005 and 2011. Primary outcome variables were post-operative complications, length of hospital stay and mortality. The authors performed multivariate analysis to determine risk factors for increased mortality in elderly patients. They also used the propensity score to ensure similar pre-operative comorbidities. The article is overall well-written and nicely structured. However, I have some major concerns addressed below. The investigated topic is obviously timely and relevant, but the presented original data do not substantially extend the presently available insight into the subject of debate. Major concerns: 1. They didn't separate between the indication for operation, if it was benign or malignant, which is an important differentiation for optimal treatment and outcome. 2. Most limitation of the study is a lack of description of initial resectability, a lack of a description of the proportion of patients with malignancy as well as insufficient details regarding intra-operative



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

handling. 3. The author didn't describe the surgical procedures, surgical management improved over the years, they included patients from 2005 till 2011 where they all operated the same way. 4. The authors should perform further analysis to show putative differences in the patient collectives. 5. As post-operative complications were the primary outcome of the analysis, the Clavien- Dindo Classification could be used as a reliable and representative compelling tool for quality assessment. Minor concerns: 1. Typesetting, grammar/style and spelling should be revised to some degree, especially within the discussion part.