

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 30295

Title: Pancreaticoduodenectomy: Secondary stenting of the celiac trunk after inefficient median arcuate ligament release and reoperation as an alternative to simultaneous hepatic artery reconstruction

Reviewer's code: 03660337

Reviewer's country: Spain

Science editor: Jing Yu

Date sent for review: 2016-09-26 18:02

Date reviewed: 2016-10-01 02:58

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[Y] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[Y] Accept
[] Grade B: Very good	[] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[] The same title	[] High priority for publication
[] Grade C: Good	[] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[] Duplicate publication	[] Rejection
[] Grade D: Fair	[] Grade D: Rejected	[Y] No	[] Minor revision
[] Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	[] Major revision
		[] The same title	
		[] Duplicate publication	
		[] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Congratulations! A great work.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 30295

Title: Pancreaticoduodenectomy: Secondary stenting of the celiac trunk after inefficient median arcuate ligament release and reoperation as an alternative to simultaneous hepatic artery reconstruction

Reviewer's code: 03261991

Reviewer's country: Hungary

Science editor: Jing Yu

Date sent for review: 2016-09-26 18:02

Date reviewed: 2016-10-15 23:10

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I like the manuscript, however I have some remarks. The text of Abstract and Introduction are very similar, so they should be further edited. The letters are not the same in the beginning of the manuscript. It would be desired to provide an intraoperative photo from the first operation, namely about the MAL release.