

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

ESPS manuscript NO: 27070

Title: Role of epidural anesthesia in a fast track liver resection protocol for cirrhotic patients - results after three years of practice

Reviewer's code: 00006258

Reviewer's country: United Kingdom

Science editor: Jin-Xin Kong

Date sent for review: 2016-05-09 01:19

Date reviewed: 2016-05-17 19:42

| 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title | <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"/> 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 manuscript describes the findings of a retrospective review to determine if there are any benefits of use of ERAS incorporating epidural during liver resection surgery. The study is reasonably large and well characterised. The control group is composed of patients who refused placement of catheter for epidural. The authors should comment on whether this refusal was based on clinical decisions or diagnoses that are likely to impact upon subsequent survival or outcomes following surgery. It is clear that broadly diagnoses in the two groups were similar but one wonders if there are specific reasons why the epidural was not used for the control group. Was the surgical team the same for procedures incorporating and not using epidural (i.e. do the same surgeons perform the resection?) There is a typo in Table 5 and the legend for this figure should be expanded to include definitions of all abbreviations for clinical scoring systems for complication severity assessment. One possible deficiency of the study is the duration of monitoring for outcome (up to 1 week post discharge). It would be interesting if the authors could comment on whether there were any longer term benefits of the ERAS protocol.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

ESPS manuscript NO: 27070

Title: Role of epidural anesthesia in a fast track liver resection protocol for cirrhotic patients - results after three years of practice

Reviewer's code: 00071717

Reviewer's country: Turkey

Science editor: Jin-Xin Kong

Date sent for review: 2016-05-09 01:19

Date reviewed: 2016-05-23 18:41

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

In general, this research is novel, manuscript presentation and readability is good. The ethics-related aspects of the research are not problematic. The English in this manuscript is sufficient. Overall manuscript organization is good.