

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

ESPS manuscript NO: 21241

Title: Long-term results after revisions of failed primary vertical banded gastroplasty

Reviewer's code: 00071687

Reviewer's country: Spain

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2015-07-08 08:27

Date reviewed: 2015-08-05 23:26

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Authors, We have read with lot of interest your paper titled Long-term Results after Revisions of Failed Primary Vertical Banded Gastroplasty. that aims to show the possibilities and results after failed VBG. The paper is acceptable and very interesting. I believe some of the conclusions given to the abstract must be more consistent like " Roux-en-Y gastric bypass seems feasible as a revision for a failed VBG. " should mention " should be preferred..." Can the authors con fire what are the mesenteric defects in the RYGBP? We do not star a line with a number " 82.2% of the current study .." Can the authors try to give more explanations regarding the cSG or cRYGBP in terms of selection of patient (??), or simple they would be able to argue that "THE ONLY CONVERSION FROM A VBG IS RYGBP" ??? Are there patients who need specific reconversions such as patients with organ transplants..... Can we have some more data to complete the nice discussion already given? Thnaks.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

ESPS manuscript NO: 21241

Title: Long-term results after revisions of failed primary vertical banded gastroplasty

Reviewer's code: 00068107

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2015-07-08 08:27

Date reviewed: 2015-07-16 18:11

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	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

Number ID: 00068107

- (1) Title accurately reflects the major topic and content of the study.
- (2) Abstract provides a clear delineation between the research background, objectives, materials and methods, results, and conclusions.
- (3) The materials and methods sufficiently described for the results and conclusions.
- (4) The study design and use of controls rational and reliable.
- (5) The statistical methods used are appropriate.
- (6) The results provide sufficient experimental evidence or data to draw firm scientific conclusions.
- (7) Discussion is well organized.
- (8) The conclusions drawn appropriately supported by the literature.
- (9) The references are appropriate, relevant, and up-to-date.
- (10) The tables and figures reflect the major findings of the study.