

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 5153

Title: Bile Leakage Test in Liver Resection: a Systematic Review and Meta-analysis

Reviewer code: 02468118

Science editor: Qi, Yuan

Date sent for review: 2013-08-19 13:42

Date reviewed: 2013-08-25 21:52

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Authors, you certainly did a lot of work, used appropriate reporting tools and software, the study is interesting, and the meta-analysis may provide useful information. However, I propose to rewrite the manuscript, especially the results and discussion sections. My second major concern is the clarity of reporting of the inclusion criteria, and the use of proper appraisal tools for included reports. I suggest to follow more closely the PRISMA checklist (as you stated in the paper). Also, I would suggest a consultation of the text with a native speaker of English for refinements. Please, find specific comments below: Abstract: Aim: "To perform a systematic review and meta-analysis evaluating the role of bile leakage test in liver resection." I think you should rethink this statement – the systematic literature review is a research process to test a hypothesis or/ and to answer a clinical or other relevant, precisely formulated, question (preferably formulated according to the PICO(S) formula) and cannot be a goal per se. Figure 1 - Search flow diagram: in the box "Citations excluded due to the failure to meet the inclusion criteria" – do you mean papers excluded after full text reading? My proposal is to follow the PRISMA flow chart, for you indicate in the paper that you base the reporting on PRISMA statement. As I have mentioned, the language needs polishing. For instance, the sentence "Studies have suggested excessive bile duct pressure from bile leakage bile test could cause of cholangiovenous reflux and cholangitis" is confusing, or the statement "were excluded in the study" is incorrect. Also, check the titles of the Tables in this context. Statistical analysis: "We used a fixed-effects model to synthesize data when heterogeneity absent, or a random-effects model would be used." – please clarify. The statement "We conducted the meta-analysis and systematic review according to the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions[20] and Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analysis (PRISMA)[21]." In my opinion

should appear in the methods section, as it is broader than only statistics. The statement “Many prospective randomized controlled trials and retrospective clinical trials..” – clinical trials, being experimental studies, are always prospective, observational studies are either prospective or retrospective – please be more precise. Methods section: You first report on limiting the search to RCTs and CCTs and then (inclusion criteria) you say that you included cohort studies – this is inconsistent and makes a difference – cohort studies are observational studies, in opposition to experimental trials. Please clarify. Databases: you separately list MEDLINE, then PubMed – in fact, you could search MEDLINE through PubMed; Science Citation Index – do you mean Web of Knowledge? Search terms: ideally, the whole search process from at least one database should be reported, e.g. in an appendix, to make a duplication of the search process possible. Please be more detailed, at least by stating what Boolean terms (AND, OR) you used, and whether the terms were MeSH terms or free terms. Selection of the studies: “Two independent authors identified and evaluated the trials for inclusion by the abstracts and full text if necessary.” – you already mentioned it in the “systematic literature search” section. Quality assessment: “the quality checklist recommended by the Cochrane Handbook” do you mean the Cochrane Risk of Bias Tool? And in my view the sentence is quite awkward. Also, please explain or refine in the text the inconsistency: the Cochrane tool is for randomised trials, while you included cohort studies as well. For cohort studies, the STROBE checklist, or the NOS scale, would be more appropriate. Results The section is written quite chaotically, and I have had difficulties in understanding. E.g. the sentence “ Four trials[12,13,14,22] reported the incidenc

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 5153

Title: Bile Leakage Test in Liver Resection: a Systematic Review and Meta-analysis

Reviewer code: 02467528

Science editor: Qi, Yuan

Date sent for review: 2013-08-19 13:42

Date reviewed: 2013-08-27 22:57

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors (Wang et al.) present a meta-analysis of the literature describing feasibility, safety and efficacy of a method to avoid complication after hepatic surgery, the so called "bile leakage test". Bile leakage test is a technique to reduce post-operative bile leakage. The topic of the article is important for researchers and the literature analysis reported by the Authors is interesting but, according to my opinion, some concerns should be addressed carefully before publication. Abstract: I suggest to rewrite the aim of the abstract to present better the manuscript. Introduction: The authors claim (pag.4) that "Bile leakage test is a common approach to reduce postoperative bile leakage. (...)". Please add a valid bibliographic reference to quote the assertion. Methods: Please detail better the algorithm of research, in addition to the keywords (pag.6). The Authors (pag.7) claim that they assessed the methodological quality of the trials using the quality checklist of the Cochrane Handbook, but they include in the study also a cohort study (that is an observational study). How they have evaluated this study? Please clarify. Results: When the authors describe figure 2 and 3 (pag.9), I think there is a mistake in the order of the numbers: Funnel Plot is the figure 3 not 2, and vice versa. Please correct the word "trails" with "trials" (pag.10, line 16). "White test versus saline solution test" should be written in bold type (pag.10). Discussion: Please correct "stud" with "study" (pag.12, line 25). The authors (pag.13) cite only one study to show morbidity related to incidental cholecystectomy, in addition this study is quite old (Kovalcik et al. 1983). Is it possible to update this reference? Please specify in the limit of the study that the findings of "white test versus saline solution test" involved only one study. Figures and Tables: In the figure 1 the sentence "Citations excluded due to failure to meet inclusion criteria (n=33)" is unclear, please clarify. I suggest to remove figure 4 and discuss the results only in the text. In the tables the years between brackets of the



Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited

Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,
315-321 Lockhart Road,
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

papers of Liu et al, and Li et al. are different from the years of publication in the references, please be consistent. Finally, the manuscript should be revised by an English native speaker