



# BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 18684

**Title:** Review of transvaginal Hybrid-NOTES cholecystectomy - systematic analysis of safety and benefit of a new procedure

**Reviewer's code:** 02550162

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2015-04-27 18:03

**Date reviewed:** 2015-06-11 03:28

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Congratulations to the authors on a very good paper on this relatively new topic. I think this paper is for the most part all written, with good information. There are certainly limitations to the database data for example, but this is addressed in the manuscript. One main problem I had was that this is really several different studies combined into one paper. I found it difficult to follow. Perhaps because the methods were each listed, and then the results. I found myself losing track of which study was done with which methods. I'm not sure the main editors would prefer this another way though: either as separate papers, or by separating each component of the study. Meaning to put the methods and then the results of each sub-component before proceeding to the next one. Maybe that seems a little strange going back from results to methods, but I think it might be easier for the reader to keep track.