

### PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

Manuscript NO: 81620

Title: Compliance with enhanced recovery after surgery predicts long-term outcome

after hepatectomy for cholangiocarcinoma

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02823337 Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: FRCS (Ed), FRCS (Gen Surg)

Professional title: Associate Professor, Chief Doctor, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Thailand

Manuscript submission date: 2022-11-18

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-11-18 13:38

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-11-19 01:58

Review time: 12 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ Y] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [ Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ Y] Rejection
Re-review	[ ]Yes [Y]No



https://www.wjgnet.com

Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

# SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The present study is the first and the most extensive study demonstrating ERAS compliance and its association with short-term and long-term outcomes of cholangiocarcinoma patients. The language quality is fine. However, this study has a few drawbacks to its scientific quality. 1. Performing a retrospective study on the ERAS program is inherently flawed in interpreting the cause and effect. A patient who suffered from fewer complications after surgery will be more likely to comply with ERAS program as the patient would require further deviation from usual management. Vice versa, one can also say that compliance with the ERAS program will cause fewer complications. The result of this study needs to be interpreted very carefully before we can draw any conclusions. 2. The sample size of the ERAS ≥50 group is tiny (only 14 patients), which may cause a significant type 2 error. 3. The ERAS program only lasted two years, from January 2015 to December 2016. It's been six years, and a longer-term outcome and survival data should be available. On the other hand, the technology and management of patients could have been improved much, and the result would be different after this time lag. It will be interesting to let the readers know how the application of the ERAS program in your hospital since 2016.



# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

Manuscript NO: 81620

Title: Compliance with enhanced recovery after surgery predicts long-term outcome

after hepatectomy for cholangiocarcinoma

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 01221925 Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: AGAF, FACS, FICS, MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Greece

Author's Country/Territory: Thailand

Manuscript submission date: 2022-11-18

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-11-18 13:21

Reviewer performed review: 2022-11-19 20:38

**Review time:** 1 Day and 7 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ Y] Rejection
Re-review	[ ]Yes [Y]No



# Baishideng

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [ Y] No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting paper evaluating the effect of ERAS compliance on long-term outcomes after hepatectomy for cholangiocarcinoma. Could the authors please respond to the following questions: 1) Since this is a retrospective study of a patient population where ERAS was not fully implemented, that raises concern for bias, since patients who were doing better for other reasons (disease extent, type of surgery, preoperative status etc) would have been more likely to have a higher number of ERAS elements in their care given that they were already better. This is a significant limitation of the paper. 2) How do the authors link the higher ERAS to longer overall survival? 3) What is the significance of "50% ERAS"?



### PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

Manuscript NO: 81620

Title: Compliance with enhanced recovery after surgery predicts long-term outcome

after hepatectomy for cholangiocarcinoma

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03721192 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: MD

**Professional title:** Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Thailand

Manuscript submission date: 2022-11-18

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-11-18 13:11

Reviewer performed review: 2022-11-27 15:41

**Review time:** 9 Days and 2 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [ Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes [ ]No



Baishideng
Publishing
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [ Y] No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Editor, it was my pleasure to be asked to read and evaluate this work entitled "Compliance of Enhanced Recovery After Surgery (ERAS) Predicting Long-Term Outcome after Hepatectomy for Cholangiocarcinoma". There are several questions I would like to propose. First," The median survival of the patients in the ERAS<50 group was 1,257 days (95%CI: 853.2-1660.8), whereas of the patients in the ERAS≥50 group was not reached", is there some mistake about ERAS≥50 group? Second, this study didn't mention and discuss laparoscopic hepatectomy for cholangiocarcinoma, as we know, laparoscopic techology played an important role in ERAS. To conclude, the manuscript is good and interesting. In my opinion, major revisions should be made. However, since my negative opinion comes only from the originality of the paper, I respect the editor's opinion. Sincerely



### RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

Manuscript NO: 81620

Title: Compliance with enhanced recovery after surgery predicts long-term outcome

after hepatectomy for cholangiocarcinoma

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 01221925 **Position:** Editorial Board

Academic degree: AGAF, FACS, FICS, MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Greece

Author's Country/Territory: Thailand

Manuscript submission date: 2022-11-18

Reviewer chosen by: Jing-Jie Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-12-30 14:48

Reviewer performed review: 2022-12-30 14:58

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [ Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [ Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous



statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

# SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I would like to thank the authors for their responses and the changes made