

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

ESPS manuscript NO: 15928

Title: First jejunal artery, an alternative graft for right hepatic artery reconstruction

Reviewer's code: 02860712

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2014-12-18 18:17

Date reviewed: 2014-12-24 21:24

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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" 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

This is an interesting case report on the right hepatic artery reconstruction using the first jejunal artery. In my view, the paper only needs minor language polishing

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

ESPS manuscript NO: 15928

Title: First jejunal artery, an alternative graft for right hepatic artery reconstruction

Reviewer's code: 02860797

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2014-12-18 18:17

Date reviewed: 2014-12-19 14:46

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting case report that may benefit for the surgeons. My minor concerns are as follows:

1) The author stated in the text that figure 2 indicated direct invasion of cancer to RHA by gross inspection, but the legend of figure 2 suggested no evidence of cancer invasion in CT scan. This discrepancy should be corrected. 2) Intraoperative parameter such as blood loss, time of reconstruction should be reported. Long-term complication of vascular reconstruction like stenosis should be reported, if possible. In addition, the margin status of RHA is required. 3) RGEPA and GSV stand for what? 4) More discussion should be focus on the indication of choice of first jejunal artery for vascular reconstruction. For example, when should first jejunal artery be considered, and how to balance the choice with other candidate vessels.