



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** Artificial Intelligence in Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

**Manuscript NO:** 68306

**Title:** Robotic Pancreaticoduodenectomy: Where Do We Stand?

**Reviewer's code:** 05427807

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Japan

**Author's Country/Territory:** United States

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-05-18

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-05-18 11:47

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-05-20 09:52

**Review time:** 1 Day and 22 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](http://www.wjgnet.com)

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Comments to the author This is a short review article on the introduction and development of robotic PD. The readers could know that robotic PD has a history of 20 years, while Lap-PD was 30 years, and the morbidity and mortality of RPD is decreasing. Considering learning curve of RPD, at least 40 cases will be necessary to acquire a standard technique for RPD. Comments 1. Brief history and development of RPD is described. However, the difficulty of introducing RPD, technical points unique to RPD, and other negative aspects of RPD are not described. The authors should focus not only the development but also the negative aspects of introducing RPD. 2. The readers might be unsatisfactory after reading this article, partly because this articles lacks this author's real impression and experience of RPD.



### PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** Artificial Intelligence in Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

**Manuscript NO:** 68306

**Title:** Robotic Pancreaticoduodenectomy: Where Do We Stand?

**Reviewer's code:** 03546646

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Full Professor, Surgeon

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Italy

**Author's Country/Territory:** United States

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-05-18

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-05-18 18:07

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-05-26 07:43

**Review time:** 7 Days and 13 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](http://www.wjgnet.com)

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

I have read with great interest the manuscript by Hussein H. Khachfe and coll. entitled "Robotic Pancreaticoduodenectomy: Where Do We Stand?". The manuscript is very well written, it deals with the subject in a satisfactory way. I suggest adding a small paragraph on the future prospects of robotic duodenopancreatectomy. Table 1 and Figure 1 help comprehensively to understand the state of the art on the subject.