PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 41927

Title: Correlation of serum albumin and prognostic nutritional index with outcomes following pancreaticoduodenectomy

Reviewer's code: 01438831

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Xue-Jiao Wang

Date sent for review: 2018-09-06

Date reviewed: 2018-09-12

Review time: 5 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	[ ] Accept (High priority)	Peer-Review:
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] Accept (General priority)	[Y] Anonymous
[Y] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[Y] Minor revision	[ ] Onymous
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejection	[ ] Major revision	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
[ ] Grade E: Do not publish		[ ] Rejection	[ ] Advanced
			[Y] General
			[ ] No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			[ ] Yes
			[Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This paper revealed postoperative PNI as a predictor of severe complication after pancreaticoduodenectomy. The author described preoperative albumin is an important factor associated with serious complications following PD as well.   Then, how does the

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

lymphocyte counts influence to the outcome after PD?   In the table, median Albumin was 34.9 and median preoperative PNI was 98.9. This means median lymphocyte counts was around 13000. Is that correct?

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

BPG Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 41927

Title: Correlation of serum albumin and prognostic nutritional index with outcomes following pancreaticoduodenectomy

Reviewer's code: 02454185

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Xue-Jiao Wang

Date sent for review: 2018-10-05

Date reviewed: 2018-10-06

Review time: 23 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	[ ] Accept (High priority)	Peer-Review:
[Y] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[Y] Accept (General priority)	[Y] Anonymous
[ ] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Minor revision	[ ] Onymous
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejection	[ ] Major revision	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
[ ] Grade E: Do not publish		[ ] Rejection	[Y] Advanced
			[ ] General
			[ ] No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			[ ] Yes
			[Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. It is unknown of the follow up period for the postoperative complication. 2. mortality is a competing risk for the postoperative complication. that is, the occurrence of death will preclude the occurrence of complication. how did you account for this informative

censoring? I suggest the use of survival analysis in the presence of competing risks or at least this should be acknowledged as a limitation for current analysis. cite a reference would be helpful for this issue (Survival analysis in the presence of competing risks.Ann Transl Med. 2017 Feb;5(3):47. doi: 10.21037/atm.2016.08.62.). 3. In the multivariable regression model, how did you choose the covariates? there are several commonly use methods such as purposeful selection (Model building strategy for logistic regression: purposeful selection. Ann Transl Med. 2016 Mar;4(6):111. doi: 10.21037/atm.2016.02.15.), stepwise and best subset (Variable selection with stepwise and best subset approaches. Ann Transl Med. 2016 Apr;4(7):136. doi: 10.21037/atm.2016.03.35.); the authors provide no information on this point.   4. In table 3, how many variables did you included in the model? it appears that only two variables were included.   5. for ROC analysis, pls also provide cnofidence interval for the area under ROC.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

BPG Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 41927

Title: Correlation of serum albumin and prognostic nutritional index with outcomes following pancreaticoduodenectomy

Reviewer's code: 00058696

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Xue-Jiao Wang

Date sent for review: 2018-10-05

Date reviewed: 2018-10-13

Review time: 8 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	[ ] Accept (High priority)	Peer-Review:
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] Accept (General priority)	[ ] Anonymous
[Y] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Minor revision	[Y] Onymous
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejection	[Y] Major revision	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
[ ] Grade E: Do not publish		[ ] Rejection	[Y] Advanced
			[ ] General
			[ ] No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			[ ] Yes
			[Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I have carefully read this new manuscript. My major questions are summarized below: 1) Core Tip: Sentence 2 starting with "Only serious complications" makes no sense and needs to be rewritten. Sentence 3 starting with "Studies have reported an"

needs an ending such as "after abdominal surgeries". Sentence starting with "The independent factors associated with" requires an "of" between "day 3" and "<". 2) Introduction: when describing references 15, 16, and 20 the authors need to tell us what these abdominal operations are. The reader does not otherwise know whether other authors have examined pancreaticoduodenectomy. The authors should state their hypothesis in the Introduction prior to their sentences starting with "Thus, the aim of our study". 3) Material and Methods: paragraph 2: "a positive bowel movement"; this is slang language; what appears to be intended is "the occurrence of a". Paragraph 3: in the sentence beginning with "Delayed gastric emptying was defined", the authors either need to provide a reference for their definition or consider the term "Delayed solid food tolerance". 4) Results: Paragraph 1: in the sentence "The postoperative mortality rate was", when (early or within what time period)? In the paragraph for Patient characteristics and operative outcomes in patients, the authors need to insert a p value in the sentence that starts "The patients in the grade III-V complications group". In the paragraph for Comparison of PNI between grade 0-II and III-V complications, the authors suggest the importance of PNI 40.5. The authors however do not provide us with any of the usual validations factors: sensitivity, specificity, negative predictive value or positive predictive value. In the paragraph for Analysis of the risk factors for grade III-V complications, the authors list a 95% CI 0.99-1.01 and then state P = 0.03. Since this confidence interval crosses 1.00 this cannot be statistically significant. Please correct. 5) Discussion: Sentence 2 starting "Serum albumin is a commonly used indicator for evaluation of nutritional status"; well not by nutritionists and so the authors either need to provide strong references for this claim or consider "a common indicator for ongoing inflammatory processes". In paragraph 2 the authors describe the risks of "Hypoalbuminemia"; but is this finding present (mean albumin is 34.1)? If there is no hypoalbuminemia, then this speculative paragraph

6

needs to be altered or removed.   For the reference by Lyu et al, the authors state that there was preoperative low serum albumin, but do not tell us how low.   Please insert this information.   In the paragraph starting with "C-reactive protein and procalcitonin are", the authors describe the importance of low albumin at postoperative day 3.   Why is it low?   What is the ½ life of serum albumin? Is it not more likely that a decline in serum albumin is a reflection of protein catabolism and is unlikely due to blockade of albumin biosynthesis? In the paragraph starting with "Postoperative PNI might be associated with" the authors raise the idea of serum albumin as a "stress marker"; don't the authors mean that serum albumin is a marker of inflammatory processes? Is there evidence that biochemical stress, which is generally defined by increased free radical production or "oxidative stress", does lead to low serum albumin? In the paragraph beginning with "There is evidence that low postoperative serum albumin", the authors suggest obtaining computed tomography.   Don't their results need to be confirmed in a prospective study prior to this suggestion? In the final paragraph with limitations, the authors need to consider stating that the lower serum albumin (34.1 versus 35.0) is a modest difference.   The authors also need to consider stating that results in their present study and the choice of POD3   PNI of 40.5 needs to be confirmed by a prospective study.   6) Table 2:   BMI for Grade III-V, the authors don't provide the range of BMIs for their patients.   Table 2:   for Albumin, for Grade 0-II and for Grade III-V, the authors need to tell us what percentage of patients had Albumin less than 35 g/L.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

BPG Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 41927

Title: Correlation of serum albumin and prognostic nutritional index with outcomes following pancreaticoduodenectomy

Reviewer's code: 02438768

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Xue-Jiao Wang

Date sent for review: 2018-10-05

Date reviewed: 2018-10-17

Review time: 11 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	[ ] Accept (High priority)	Peer-Review:
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] Accept (General priority)	[Y] Anonymous
[Y] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[Y] Minor revision	[ ] Onymous
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejection	[ ] Major revision	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
[ ] Grade E: Do not publish		[ ] Rejection	[ ] Advanced
			[Y] General
			[ ] No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			[ ] Yes
			[Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Comments for ESPS Manuscript NO 41927 This is a well written manuscript reporting interest cases. I would suggest that the authors make an appropriate explanation for Figure 1.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

BPG Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No