

## ESPS Peer-review Report

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

**Ms:** 2983

**Title:** Systematic review and meta-analysis of laparoscopy-assisted and open total gastrectomy for gastric cancer

**Reviewer code:** 01446165

**Science editor:** l.l.wen@wjgnet.com

**Date sent for review:** 2013-03-31 20:41

**Date reviewed:** 2013-04-17 06:25

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" 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"/> Existed	<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"/> 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

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS:

A well written paper which will add a great deal to the literature on the subject. I think one of the most significant conclusions from this work is the lack of RCTs surrounding the field. This meta-analysis is predominantly case-comparison trials (mainly retrospective) and as such incorporates both the selection bias of the included trials and the heterogeneity of the data associated with these sorts of trials even with the best statistical methods of weighing the data it still exposes the biases of the included trials. Could the authors highlight this clearer within the manuscript, perhaps in figure 1 they could consider adding a column highlighting the level of clinical evidence (Oxford, uk) as is assigned to each of the papers included. Minor typographical errors noted but only a few. Overall a good paper.