

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

ESPS manuscript NO: 24831

Title: Benefits of post-operative oral protein supplementation in gastrointestinal surgery patients: A systematic review of clinical trials

Reviewer's code: 00535894

Reviewer's country: Poland

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-02-14 15:51

Date reviewed: 2016-02-15 02:51

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" 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"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" 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

Please re-write the abstract to show your results

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

ESPS manuscript NO: 24831

Title: Benefits of post-operative oral protein supplementation in gastrointestinal surgery patients: A systematic review of clinical trials

Reviewer's code: 02941357

Reviewer's country: Netherlands

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-02-14 15:51

Date reviewed: 2016-02-27 18:42

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"/> Duplicate publication	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input checked="" 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

I would like to comment on the article: "Benefits of post-operative oral protein supplementation in gastrointestinal surgery patients: A systematic."after gastrointestinal anastomosis; a randomized controlled trial" by the aauthors Crickmer et al. In this study the effects of protein supplementation are investigated in patients undergoing gastrointestinal surgery. The manuscript is well written and has a sound methodology. Although the limitations of this systematic review are well discussed, my major concern is the heterogeneity between the studies (for example both malnourished and normonourished patients) and the lack of standardization of protein supplementationIn my opinion, this precludes any conclusion to be made from the included trials To be more specific: 1. Both malnourished and normonourished patients are included. Are the results more homogenous when only trials are included in which normonourished patients undergo surgery? 2. Did the authors perform tests for heterogeneity between studies? 3. An estimate of an overall effect would substantiate the conclusion (pooled RR or weighted mean differences). Especially since the Power of the individual studies is too small. 4. The authors mention protein intake and weight loss in the



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>

results. What is the relation with postoperative complications? Minor points: 1. The title seems incomplete 2. The results of the search may also be presented as flow-chart and please specify the reasons for exclusion of the 587 and later 35 records. 3. Discussion can be compacted.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

ESPS manuscript NO: 24831

Title: Benefits of post-operative oral protein supplementation in gastrointestinal surgery patients: A systematic review of clinical trials

Reviewer's code: 00502803

Reviewer's country: India

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-02-14 15:51

Date reviewed: 2016-03-05 12:51

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors have made a good collation of the data to assess if there are any benefits of post-operative protein nutritional supplementation following gastrointestinal surgery. The manuscript is well written and covers the salient points from the published studies. Some concerns: 1. The title should be complete. It can be made into "Benefits of post-operative oral protein supplementation in gastrointestinal surgery patients: A systematic review of the evidence". 2. The time period for which to articles were retrieved is not clear. 3. A PRISMA figure can be included. 4. A table on the outcome based on all studies can be included.