

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 16334

Title: OUTCOMES OF ROBOTIC VERSUS LAPAROSCOPIC HEPATECTOMY: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW AND META-ANALYSIS

Reviewer's code: 02471365

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2015-01-12 13:41

Date reviewed: 2015-02-04 21:58

| CLASSIFICATION | LANGUAGE EVALUATION | SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT | CONCLUSION |
|--|--|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing | PubMed Search: | <input checked="" 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 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

This is a well done, rigorous meta-analysis that is nicely described and the conclusions are carefully balanced. It should make an important contribution to this literature.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 16334

Title: OUTCOMES OF ROBOTIC VERSUS LAPAROSCOPIC HEPATECTOMY: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW AND META-ANALYSIS

Reviewer's code: 02992811

Reviewer's country: South Korea

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2015-01-12 13:41

Date reviewed: 2015-01-13 18:53

| CLASSIFICATION | LANGUAGE EVALUATION | SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT | CONCLUSION |
|---|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing | PubMed Search: | <input checked="" 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"/> Plagiarism | <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor | | [Y] No | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision |
| | | BPG Search: | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism | |
| | | [Y] No | |

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

There was no problem to publish in this journal.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 16334

Title: OUTCOMES OF ROBOTIC VERSUS LAPAROSCOPIC HEPATECTOMY: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW AND META-ANALYSIS

Reviewer's code: 02468118

Reviewer's country: Poland

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2015-01-12 13:41

Date reviewed: 2015-02-24 18:27

| CLASSIFICATION | LANGUAGE EVALUATION | SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT | CONCLUSION |
|---|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing | PubMed 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

Dear Authors, I have analysed with interest your manuscript entitled Robotic vs laparoscopic hepatectomy: a meta-analysis. The paper adds useful information for practice and research, and probably for policy. I think your negative findings, addressing possible de-implementation of robotic hepatectomy, could be underlined. However, I have some concerns regarding the process of reporting and in my view it needs to be revised. Major concerns: You followed the PRISMA statement. However, PRISMA is not only for reporting meta-analysis data but for the whole systematic review process. Also, the PRISMA checklist could supplement the manuscript. Why did you choose PRISMA, not MOOSE for SRs of observational studies. Please explain. For inclusion criteria, it is important to indicate study type / design as well; also, following the PICO(ST) scheme (participants – interventions-outcomes – study types, would clarify reporting of the inclusion criteria; you have registered your SR at JBI, therefore you can follow the same PICO scheme as the one in their registration form. Also, study types / designs are important prerequisites as regards the meta-analysis itself. Can the data be combined? The sentence below – please provide more

information as regards study types or explain that you were able to conduct a meta-analysis: To our knowledge, this is the first systematic review and meta-analysis comparing robotics to laparoscopy for liver resections. In this analysis, it was possible to include only 7 studies containing 694 patients; In my view, you should provide more detail (or put it clearly – preferably in the inclusion criteria and results sections) about the studies you have included. Also, reasons of exclusions (PRISMA flowchart) should be reported (preferably list of excluded studies, with reasons, as well, as an appendix). NOS scale – you have reported scores (Table 1), but interpretation is lacking. Also, NOS is only mentioned in the text in the “methods (risk of bias assessment)” section, not in “results” or “discussions”. The NOS scale is for retrospective studies. Did you include only retrospective studies? “Conclusions” section: I think a sentence addressing further research needs and weaknesses of the available evidence could be added – for me those are your main findings. You are also mentioning costs in the text, not in the conclusions. Minor tips: Abstract: ..articles dated.. – published would be more clear “Data extraction” section – reference to Tables (1, 2); Please check language errors in the disclosure section: have / has; and the sentence below is for me unclear: However, due to the absence of reported RCTs, in literature are described 16 meta-analysis comparing laparoscopic versus open liver resection utilizing retrospective data Also – verbs need to be added? Of these, 196 papers were excluded for the following reasons: 110 were not related to liver resections, 81 did not compare techniques, 3 were? review articles and 2 were? letters.