

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 12498

Title: Is Hand-Sewn Comparable with Stapler in the Incidence of Anastomotic Leakage for the Esophagogastric Anastomosis after Oesophagectomy? A Meta-Analysis

Reviewer code: 00003940

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2014-07-13 13:06

Date reviewed: 2014-07-24 10:47

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<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"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This meta analysis addresses an important question for oesophago-gastric surgeons. There are many minor English errors in the attached manuscript.

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 12498

Title: Is Hand-Sewn Comparable with Stapler in the Incidence of Anastomotic Leakage for the Esophagogastric Anastomosis after Oesophagectomy? A Meta-Analysis

Reviewer code: 00182276

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2014-07-13 13:06

Date reviewed: 2014-07-25 21:30

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<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 type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The topic is very interesting and it is an useful comparison. Language polish is required.

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 12498

Title: Is Hand-Sewn Comparable with Stapler in the Incidence of Anastomotic Leakage for the Esophagogastric Anastomosis after Oesophagectomy? A Meta-Analysis

Reviewer code: 00182538

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2014-07-13 13:06

Date reviewed: 2014-07-28 13:50

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"/> Existing	<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	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors meta-analyzed the incidence rates of anastomotic leak and stricture after esophagectomy between mechanical and hand-sewn esophago-gastrostomy adding new results from a few randomized trials after the meta-analyses reported previously for the same purpose. However, I am concerned about the following aspects. First, the authors should not have added the results from the randomized trial literatures which were not written in English (references #14 and #20). This is because most of readers cannot understand the original contents in these two literatures and cannot judge whether the literature selection for this meta-analysis was correct. Therefore, it is better for the authors to remove these two literatures from their meta-analysis. Second, the authors divided into two groups according the published year in the subset analysis. Why did the authors use 2003 to divide the two groups? What was it based on? The authors need to describe their rationale about this division in the Methods. The authors also need to interpret the result from this subset analysis in the Discussion. Finally, the authors also need to response to the following concerns. 1) Hand-sewnu HH as in author name in the Table 1 should be Hsu HH. 2) The authors should add the reference number in the Table 1. 3) There are duplicated references in #6 and #28. 4) References of #12 and #16 show the same results but written in two different languages.

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 12498

Title: Is Hand-Sewn Comparable with Stapler in the Incidence of Anastomotic Leakage for the Esophagogastric Anastomosis after Oesophagectomy? A Meta-Analysis

Reviewer code: 02546581

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2014-07-13 13:06

Date reviewed: 2014-07-29 05:37

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<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 type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a nicely written manuscript and the analyses seem to be well performed. The topic of the esophagogastric anastomosis is not really new, but it is still one of the mainly important problems in esophageal surgery. I have only minor issues to mention. - The authors should describe in more detail, why they performed this meta-analysis although there are several published before. What was the special aim in contrast to the others? - The table and figure references should be given in more detail in the results part, so the reader can easily find the mentioned analyses.

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 12498

Title: Is Hand-Sewn Comparable with Stapler in the Incidence of Anastomotic Leakage for the Esophagogastric Anastomosis after Oesophagectomy? A Meta-Analysis

Reviewer code: 00182188

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2014-07-13 13:06

Date reviewed: 2014-08-10 13:05

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<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"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript has interesting information and can be published, but I have some recommendations and some questions to be done. 1. Important corrections to the language (English) need to be made. 2. From the title and the abstract, we get the impression that the primary outcome is anastomotic leakage, but in the methods section two primary outcomes are mentioned (anastomotic leakage and 30-day mortality). Usually, one primary outcome is chosen. 3. Figure 1, in the eligibility phase, 14 articles were eliminated (6 because they were retrospective cohort studies and 6 because they were review articles). What about the remaining 2 articles, why were they eliminated? 4. Avoid repetition of results in the conclusion with the following suggestion: "This study revealed that there appear to be no significant difference in the incidence of developing anastomotic leakage, between the hand-sewn and the stapler group, however the use of a stapler method contributed to reduce the anastomotic leakage rate in the latest decade and is superior to the single layer hand-sewn in preventing postoperative anastomotic leakage".