



**ESPS Peer-review Report**

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

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 8967

**Title:** Laparoscopic Pancreaticoduodenectomy via Reverse –“V” approach with four ports: initial experience and perioperative Outcomes

**Reviewer code:** 01872558

**Science editor:** Wang, Jin-Lei

**Date sent for review:** 2014-01-14 09:23

**Date reviewed:** 2014-02-23 16:52

| 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                            | 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**

Review for ESPS No. 8967. The manuscript entitled "Laparoscopic Pancreaticoduodenectomy via Reverse –“V” approach with four ports: initial experience and perioperative Outcomes" by Wang et al is very well written. In this retrospective study, the authors evaluated the feasibility, safety, and efficacy of the modified laparoscopic pancreaticoduodenectomy. Some revisions are needed. 1 The structure of main text is not so clear. Methods and results section is confused. The authors should make those two sections more clear, and not mixing them together. 2 The discussion is clear, and very well. 3 Some language polishing should be revised. 4 Too more figures, some of them can be deleted. Please check them carefully. 5 References are updating.