

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 5051

Title: Successful Interventional Radiological Management of Multiple Postoperative Complications of Laparoscopic Distal Pancreatectomy: a case report

Reviewer code: 00227359

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2013-08-12 16:31

Date reviewed: 2013-08-13 01:06

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	language polishing	BPG Search:	<input checked="" 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

This is a case report written quite friendly. Pictures are clear and help the text. My single suggestion is an advise from the authors to the other surgeons to prevent all these problems. What is their recommendation to avoid all those complications? And, do they have some more additional preventive approaches after this experience? Were they do any chang in their sugical practice or not?

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 5051

Title: Successful Interventional Radiological Management of Multiple Postoperative Complications of Laparoscopic Distal Pancreatectomy: a case report

Reviewer code: 00505679

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2013-08-12 16:31

Date reviewed: 2013-08-23 06:52

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	language polishing	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

It would be necessary to clarify some aspects of the case. 1. Was there any intraoperative complication? 2. It would be interesting to know the body mass index of the patient (BMI). 3. What was the size of the tumor extracted? 5. What was the surgical time? 6. What type of prophylactic antibiotic was employed throughout the case? 7. It is necessary to specify more precisely the follow up time. From April 2009 till date? 8. It would be interesting to readers if the authors would summarize changes in their daily practice (change the stuff pancreatic closing?..use of RF-assisted device to sealing pancreatic parenchyma?)