



Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited

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

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 6474

Title: Minimally Invasive Radical Pancreatectomy for Left-sided Pancreatic Cancer; Current Status and Future perspectives

Reviewer code: 00503551

Science editor: Wen, Ling-Ling

Date sent for review: 2013-10-22 14:06

Date reviewed: 2013-10-29 10:06

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 checked="" 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 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 review article, the clinical evidence of radical antegrade modular pancreatectomy (RAMPS)-based minimally invasive approach (laparoscopic or robotic) for left-sided pancreatic cancer was reviewed. Recently, the laparoscopic distal pancreatectomy has been widespread and is thought to be acceptable in the oncological aspect in well-selected left sided pancreatic cancer. The authors conclude that the use of laparoscopic or robotic anterior RAMPS is feasible and safe for margin-negative resection in well-selected left sided pancreatic cancer. 1. Throughout the manuscript, same content is repeatedly described and the manuscript looks like too long. 2. There are too many not available data in Table 1. Is this Table necessary? 3. It would be better to refer to oncological, histopathological and prognostic data obtained by open radical surgery compared with minimally invasive radical surgery. Please add following references. 1) Nakao A, et al. Oncological problems in pancreatic cancer surgery. World J Gastroenterol. 2006; 12: 4466-72 2) Kanda M, et al. Invasion of the splenic artery is a crucial prognostic factor in carcinoma of the body and tail of the pancreas. Ann Surg. 2010;251:483-7 3) Yamamura K, et al. Clinicopathologic study of intrapancreatic cancer spread in carcinoma of the body and tail of the pancreas. Pancreas. 2012;41:753-8



Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited

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

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 6474

Title: Minimally Invasive Radical Pancreatectomy for Left-sided Pancreatic Cancer; Current Status and Future perspectives

Reviewer code: 00069082

Science editor: Wen, Ling-Ling

Date sent for review: 2013-10-22 14:06

Date reviewed: 2013-11-07 13:48

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade B (Very good)	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] 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 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 very interesting and comprehensive article on the positive and controversial issues associated with distal pancreatic resection. It is a review that covers all aspects of the problem. It is well-written and informative. The selection of literature is adequate. The conclusions drawn are justified. There are minor editorial problems that can easily be fixed by careful check of the manuscript.



Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited

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

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 6474

Title: Minimally Invasive Radical Pancreatectomy for Left-sided Pancreatic Cancer; Current Status and Future perspectives

Reviewer code: 02459269

Science editor: Wen, Ling-Ling

Date sent for review: 2013-10-22 14:06

Date reviewed: 2013-11-08 05:45

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

This comprehensive review is limited severely by the English language used. The manuscript would be improved with further editing. The way the evidence is organized is confusing and needs to be restructured. The review of existing experience is instructive and thorough.