

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Meta-Analysis

Manuscript NO: 67036

Title: Maturation of robotic liver resection during the last decade: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Reviewer's code: 00052899

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Chief Doctor, Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Japan

Manuscript submission date: 2021-04-13

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-04-13 13:55

Reviewer performed review: 2021-04-15 13:51

Review time: 1 Day and 23 Hours

| | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| Scientific quality | <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 Grade E: Do not publish |
| Language quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection |
| Conclusion | <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 |
| Re-review | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| Peer-reviewer statements | 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
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis to compare the laparoscopic liver resection (LLR) and robotic liver resection (RLR) and found that the clinical outcomes of RLR are comparable to those of LLR. The article provides useful information to evaluate the emerging RLR. There are some issues that should be further addressed by the authors. 1. Did the authors search other database except for Pubmed, for example Embase? 2. The analysis of the heterogeneity of the included studies was not shown. 3. The results section should be re-organized and subtitles are needed. 4. What are the results of the publication bias analysis?

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Meta-Analysis

Manuscript NO: 67036

Title: Maturation of robotic liver resection during the last decade: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Reviewer's code: 00052899

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Chief Doctor, Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Japan

Manuscript submission date: 2021-04-13

Reviewer chosen by: Man Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-07-08 12:20

Reviewer performed review: 2021-07-08 16:23

Review time: 4 Hours

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The present systematic review and meta-analysis provides insights into the clinical outcomes of robotic liver resection compared to laparoscopic liver resection. The manuscript has been improved after revision. Minor points are listed as below. 1. Analysis of the heterogeneities includes the exploration of the source of heterogeneity. Meta-regression and subgroup analysis may be applied when the heterogeneity is significant. 2. Although Newcastle-Ottawa Scale is a useful tool to assess the quality of the included studies, publication bias is more often assessed by the Begg's and Egger's tests.