

ESPS Peer-review Report
Name of Journal: World Journal of Hepatology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 7886

Title: Central Hepatectomy for centrally located malignant liver tumors: A systematic review

Reviewer code: 00159698

Science editor: Ma, Ya-Juan

Date sent for review: 2013-12-05 09:24

Date reviewed: 2014-01-09 05:52

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a well written thorough review of the technique and outcomes of this surgical procedure. It should be published. There are a number of grammatical errors; fixing those is my only suggestion. I would also shorten the abstract.

ESPS Peer-review Report
Name of Journal: World Journal of Hepatology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 7886

Title: Central Hepatectomy for centrally located malignant liver tumors: A systematic review

Reviewer code: 00054683

Science editor: Ma, Ya-Juan

Date sent for review: 2013-12-05 09:24

Date reviewed: 2014-01-09 16:14

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a very interesting and well written systematic review about central hepatectomy outcomes. I have only some minor comments: 1)Page 8; "Study characteristics and operative deaths": please add the total number of patients by indication 2)Page 9; "Mortality and morbidity": how the 19.8% bile leakage morbidity was computed? (if data are pooled together please specify how you did it in the methods section) In addition, if available, please add the same proportions for the other complications. 3)Page 10; the same observation made in point 9 can be done when reporting mortality in this paragraph 4)Page 14; in comparison to the work of Stratopoulos what is new in the present review? (I believe that the present review encompasses more recent articles, so please add this information) 5) Page 16; please remove "demonstrated" from conclusion section 6) Tables: please add in the legend, how pooled proportions and pooled means were calculated. It was used a meta-analytic approach (i.e. random effect DerSimonian approach) or it was a simple weighted pooling? This point is the most important of my comments.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Hepatology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 7886

Title: Central Hepatectomy for centrally located malignant liver tumors: A systematic review

Reviewer code: 02527733

Science editor: Ma, Ya-Juan

Date sent for review: 2013-12-05 09:24

Date reviewed: 2014-01-09 17:00

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

A nice topic and a well written review about central hepatectomy outcomes. I just think the Abstract is too long.

ESPS Peer-review Report
Name of Journal: World Journal of Hepatology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 7886

Title: Central Hepatectomy for centrally located malignant liver tumors: A systematic review

Reviewer code: 00183029

Science editor: Ma, Ya-Juan

Date sent for review: 2013-12-05 09:24

Date reviewed: 2014-01-12 08:56

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In the present manuscript the authors performed a meta-analysis to evaluate the implication of central hepatectomy (CH) for the management of central hepatic malignancies and to compare the perioperative, short and long term results of CH to lobar/extended hemihepatectomy. The authors concluded that CH is a promising option for anatomical parenchymal preserving procedure in patients with centrally located liver malignancies; it is safe and comparable in both perioperative, early and long term outcomes when compared to patients undergoing hemi-/extended hepatectomy.

1) Authors searches MEDLINE (PubMed) from January 1993 to June 2013 for studies. There were 21 relevant studies were found with a total of 895 subjects included into this meta-analysis. The number of acquired papers would be enough for the review. However, further high-quality studies based on larger sample sizes are still needed to confirm the conclusion. 2) The authors did not assess the publication bias by visual examination of funnel plot and statistical tests. Furthermore, whether there were significant heterogeneities between studies were unknown. These would be important limitations of the review. The authors did not mention these point in the limitations of their meta-analysis.