

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 9891

Title: RECONSTRUCTION AFTER PANCREATODUODENECTOMY:
PANCREATOJEJUNOSTOMY VERSUS PANCREATOGASTROSTOMY

Reviewer code: 01557283

Science editor: Cui, Xue-Mei

Date sent for review: 2013-08-30 13:58

Date reviewed: 2013-10-07 17:14

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 checked="" 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

Major comments. 1. In the field of pancreatic surgery, controversy regarding operatively placed drains has recently emerged. Intra-abdominal drains around the pancreatic anastomosis may have the risk of retrograde infection and the potential damage induced by mechanical suction pressure. However, the authors did not discuss whether or not the postoperative drain management may reduce the incidence of pancreatic fistula (PF). Recently, Kawai et al. (Ann Surg 2006;244:1-7), Satoi, et al. (Pancreas 2008;37:128-133), and Bassi, et al. (Ann Surg 2010;252:207-214) showed that early drain removal after pancreaticoduodenectomy (PD) was an independent factor in reducing the incidence of abdominal complications including PF. The authors may have to briefly discuss the relationship between the postoperative management and PF. 2. The authors precisely analyzed the technique of the pancreaticojejunostomy in the present review. However, it may be interesting to add a description of novel techniques, e.g., a two-layer technique consisting of an outer full thickness pancreas-to-seromuscular jejunal anastomosis and an inner duct-to-mucosal anastomosis, so called Blumgart's technique (Grobmyer, et al. J Am Coll Surg 2010;210:54-59). Minor comments 1. The references No. 49 and 64 are the same article. 2. The references No. 8 and 22 are the same article. 3. The references No. 51 and 68 may be the same article. 4. The reference No. 60 is wrong. The article is "Uchida E, Tajiri T, Nakamura Y, Aimoto T, Naito Z. Relationship between grade of fibrosis in pancreatic stump and postoperative pancreatic exocrine activity after pancreaticoduodenectomy: with special reference to insufficiency of pancreaticointestinal anastomosis. J Nippon Med Sch. 2002 Dec;69(6):549-56."

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 9891

Title: RECONSTRUCTION AFTER PANCREATODUODENECTOMY:
PANCREATOJEJUNOSTOMY VERSUS PANCREATOGASTROSTOMY

Reviewer code: 02494652

Science editor: Cui, Xue-Mei

Date sent for review: 2013-08-30 13:58

Date reviewed: 2013-10-18 19:04

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" 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

With interest I have read this paper and I don't have comment to do