

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 10365

Title: The effect of somatostatin analogue followed D2 radical gastrectomy with vagina vasorum dissection in advanced gastric cancer patients: A prospective, single-blind, randomized and placebo-controlled study

Reviewer code: 00069379

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2014-03-28 15:26

Date reviewed: 2014-04-22 18:57

| 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 | <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

Comments to the authors This is a well structured work with excellent statistical analysis. However the topic of the article is not really new and the result and the conclusion is quite poor. For reconsideration for publication the authors must give a much better conclusion with recommendations of the application of somatostatin analogues. In which cases it is offered, how long, which dosage? Financial point of view would be necessary to be presented! What is the price of somatostatin analogues and how much the complications costs? The manuscript contains many grammatical mistakes like: in the abstract "Differencies" "differencies" capital letters at the midst of the sentence, small letter at the beginning of the sentence. One sentence is not understandable in the results part of the abstract. In the introduction part vagina vasorum is small at the beginning of a sentence. At the "Primary and secondary endpoint" part "supper" etc. In the "Randomization" part it is written that the patients got 250 vg/h of something. We can find out, that it would be any kind of somatostatin analogue product. It needs to be written which product it was. There is just a few words of the doctors who completed this operations. It must be emphasized that the same group of phisicians have done this operations both groups! If didn't, the results are not valuable. Table 1. There is no unit of measurement. It must be completed. After Bormann type: four boxes. What does it mean?