

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 7643

Title: Laparoscopic liver resection for malignancy: A review analysis

Reviewer code: 00073640

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2013-11-28 09:05

Date reviewed: 2013-12-25 04:44

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input checked="" 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 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

Manuscript Number: 7643 Title: Laparoscopic liver resection for malignancy: A review analysis

COMMENTS: The subject of this article is interesting, but it is difficult to read the whole manuscript without knowing and understanding of what the article is about. I strongly suggest re-formation of the article: For example (I expose only few the most important points): The structure of abstract is not appropriate - mostly the first part (methods) does not belong in the abstract section but in the further structure of the manuscript - but in the manuscript authors did not include any Methods section - I suggest to reconsider the structure of abstract and the whole manuscript: - introduction section is missing (since this is very surgically based manuscript I strongly suggest to include the introduction section in your manuscript: what is this paper about, what is current knowledge on this field, what are the aims of the present study and why are the presented data important) - the section - History of laparoscopic liver resection: Authors wrote that 50% of laparoscopic liver resections are now performed for malignant lesions... According to the title of manuscript I suspect that the manuscript analyzes this 50% of liver resections, but I am not sure since there is no statement or sentence about it. And if this is the case, why are there sections Oncologic results, Resection margin, Hepatocellular carcinoma, Colorectal liver metastasis at the end of the manuscript? Authors mentioned in the second section (indicated as Indications and contraindications) only the types of malignancy - if this is the manuscript dealing with the laparoscopic liver resection for malignancy (Title: Laparoscopic liver resection for malignancy: A review analysis) - I would expect the basic explanation or necessary basic knowledge about the malignancies (type of malignancy, %, survival, prognosis etc) that are analyzed in the manuscript as



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, United States

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242 Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com <http://www.wjgnet.com>

well as any explanation if the type of malignancy can affect the results....if yes, the result cannot be merged but should be separately analyzed for each malignancy... Tables - it is very difficult to elucidate the references of the data presented in the tables - I strongly suggest to insert one more column and to put the references in additional column of the table for each study - why are there no texts for the tables I strongly suggest significant reformation of the article.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 7643

Title: Laparoscopic liver resection for malignancy: A review analysis

Reviewer code: 02527733

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2013-11-28 09:05

Date reviewed: 2013-12-25 11:59

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 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)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Though the topic of this paper is interesting, this is an elusive manuscript, for the disordered structure of the abstract and whole manuscript. Moreover, this manuscript intends to review the current situation of laparoscopic liver resection for malignancy. In fact, many types of malignancy may be in the liver, for example, HCC, colorectal cancer metastasis. The main problem of this manuscript is that it focus on too many issues.

ESPS Peer-review Report
Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 7643

Title: Laparoscopic liver resection for malignancy: A review analysis

Reviewer code: 00006499

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2013-11-28 09:05

Date reviewed: 2013-12-27 01:15

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 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 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

In this study, authors provide a review of laparoscopic liver resection for malignancy. This will be of broad interest to Gastroenterologists. It is carefully performed by an experienced group, and several minor concerns should be addressed: 1. The Tables should be numbered. 2. Page numbers should be added. 3. Table 1, Zhang is missing # of patients. 4. Table #1 would be improved by adding tumor type (HCC or mCRC) column. Several important references are missing: 5. For Lap resection of mCRC, the authors should add the study of 109 patients to tables 1 and 3: Nguyen KT, et al, Minimally invasive liver resection for metastatic colorectal cancer: a multi-institutional, international report of safety, feasibility, and early outcomes. Ann Surg. 2009; 250:842-848. 6. Likewise, Nguyen KT, et al which included lap resection of HCC/mCRC in 41 patients should be added to Table 1. Nguyen KT, et al, Comparative benefits of laparoscopic versus open hepatic resection: a critical appraisal. Arch Surg, 2011; 146:348-56. 7. For lap major hepatectomy section, the authors should correct the largest series of 210 patients by Dagher et al (not Martin et al). Dagher I, et al. Laparoscopic major hepatectomy: an evolution in standard of care. Ann Surg. 2009; 250:856-860. 8. For robotic liver resection, the recent large series by Tsung et al should be added; Tsung A, et al. Robotic Versus Laparoscopic Hepatectomy: A Matched Comparison. Ann Surg. 2013 Sep 16.

ESPS Peer-review Report
Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 7643

Title: Laparoscopic liver resection for malignancy: A review analysis

Reviewer code: 02861643

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2013-11-28 09:05

Date reviewed: 2014-01-09 18:06

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input checked="" 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 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)		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

This manuscript thoroughly reviews the history and advances on the laparoscopic resection for liver malignancy, including the indications and contraindications, minor and major resections, hand-assisted technique, Robotic resection, operative technical details, and the outcomes. The text is generally well written, however, none of the three tables has title or be cited in the text. Tables 2 and Table 3 make a list of the survival rates of laparoscopic resection for liver malignancy. It would be better if the survival rates of open surgery are also listed in the tables. In addition, I could not find Background and conclusions in the abstract.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 7643

Title: Laparoscopic liver resection for malignancy: A review analysis

Reviewer code: 00012309

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2013-11-28 09:05

Date reviewed: 2014-04-11 15:50

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input checked="" 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 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	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a nice work, yet perhaps a little unbalanced in favor of the described maneuver. Could the authors develop a deeper analysis of the publications expressing a stronger criticism?