

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

ESPS manuscript NO: 14434

Title: Sentinel node navigation surgery for gastric cancer: overview and perspective

Reviewer code: 02504712

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2014-10-03 16:33

Date reviewed: 2014-10-17 18:36

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"/> Existing	<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	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a review of Sentinel Node Navigation Surgery for early Gastric Cancer. The review addresses the history, indications for the utility, Surgical technique including dyes and radioactive tracers, Detection of cancer cells in lymph nodes and validation of the technique. The authors also provide a glimpse of future perspectives. In general, this is a focussed review on a specialised subject which is very useful. Currently the review is presented as a monograph. The article is well referenced. The authors need to address the following issues: 1. There are some English Language violations which need to be corrected to convey the overall message of the article. 2. There are some abbreviations used without full word explanation. 3. The authors need to embrace the review methodology throughout the manuscript. The title should have the term review or systematic review, the search methodology should be outlined (how were the articles identified and was the review systematic or selective). 4. The article is currently presented as a monograph. As such, it lacks scientific rigour and presenting it as a review (with a small amount of revision) should improve the rate of the manuscript. 4. The methods used and results should be presented separately and then commented on in the discussion.