

## ESPS Peer-review Report

**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 5494

**Title:** Prediction and diagnosis of anastomotic leakage after colorectal surgery: a systematic review of literature

**Reviewer code:** 02546361

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

**Date sent for review:** 2013-09-13 10:29

**Date reviewed:** 2013-09-15 21:53

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)		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

Well-written paper on a wanting subject. Comments are provided below. Introduction: "There is an important time frame between local dehiscence of the anastomosis and clinical signs of peritonitis and sepsis. Therefore, early detection of CAL is key. Short-term morbidity and mortality, as well as detrimental long-term effects, such as permanent stoma, might be reduced if CAL is detected and treated in an early phase." The first sentence (reference please, also) does not lead to the conclusion in the second. Perhaps the third does, but this needs to be clarified. I suggest that the first two sentences may be omitted entirely -?the message is given and obvious in the third. Results: I am wondering whether the authors have omitted Vignali et al 2000, who investigated the utility of laser-doppler to predict anastomotic leakage. This reference may also be included, as ROC curve is provided (and not only evaluation of the blood flow). Discussion: "In a yet unpublished study on tracking of surgical site infections (SSI), van Ramshorst et al. found that protocolled tracking yields a higher reported incidence of SSI than self-reported detection<sup>82</sup>." I suggest that this paragraph should be omitted as the data is still not published (and peer-reviewed). "This statement is supported by unpublished data from our own group, showing that drain fluid can be used for quantative measurement of Enterococcus faecalis on POD 3 and has a sensitivity for CAL of 86.7%<sup>83</sup>." This paragraph should be omitted for the same reason. This is a systematic review of available peer-reviewed evidence, and should not incorporate non-published data, not even in the discussion.

## ESPS Peer-review Report

**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 5494

**Title:** Prediction and diagnosis of anastomotic leakage after colorectal surgery: a systematic review of literature

**Reviewer code:** 00057989

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

**Date sent for review:** 2013-09-13 10:29

**Date reviewed:** 2013-09-27 18:31

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"/> 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 review paper is well-written and I enjoyed the paper. I think this paper is worth publishing.