

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 27928

Title: Robot-assisted laparoscopic gastrectomy for gastric cancer

Reviewer's code: 02537326

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2016-06-27 16:09

Date reviewed: 2016-07-11 20:01

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 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

The authors had reviewed about the robot-assisted laparoscopic gastrectomy for gastric cancer. The manuscript is basically well written, however, the manuscript lacks new findings as there already have been several reviews for robotic gastrectomy. So, the manuscript should be revised according to following comments. 1. The authors would better focus on the safetiness of rebotic gastrectomy. There are several papers those describe the postoperative complications of robotic gastrectomy in comparion with laparoscopic gastrectomy (Seo HS, J Surg Res, 2015, Suda K, Surg Endsc, 2015). 2. There are several review articles very similar to the manuscript. The authors should cite these reviews (Son T et al. J Surg Oncol 2015, Terashima M, GAstric CAncer 2015 and so on). 3. The authors should separate the case-control study and meta-analysis in Table 2. 4. The evidence level of prospective study is much higher than retrospective study. The authors should discuss prospective study separately from retrospective studies. One more prospective study should be cited (Tokinaga M, Surg Endosc, 2015). 5. The authors should describe the searching criteria of the references. 6. Discussion is not necessary, as the manuscript is a review article.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 27928

Title: Robot-assisted laparoscopic gastrectomy for gastric cancer

Reviewer's code: 00503563

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2016-06-27 16:09

Date reviewed: 2016-07-13 18:21

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 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		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

The authors reviewed the clinical utility of robot-assisted laparoscopic gastrectomy (RAG) for gastric cancer. Although this review is informative for readers, there are some queries and comments. Comments 1. In Table 1 and 2, the authors should indicate the pathological stage in enrolled patients. 2. How do the authors discuss about the clinical significance of RAG in each patients with early and advanced gastric cancer?

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 27928

Title: Robot-assisted laparoscopic gastrectomy for gastric cancer

Reviewer's code: 00073423

Reviewer's country: Lithuania

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2016-06-27 16:09

Date reviewed: 2016-07-15 01:57

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	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

It is well prepared and comprehensive review on the robotic assisted techniques. 1. I think the review is too long and could be shortened without losing its quality. 2. It has to be discussed if this review is a relevant for the World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy?

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 27928

Title: Robot-assisted laparoscopic gastrectomy for gastric cancer

Reviewer's code: 02444931

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2016-06-27 16:09

Date reviewed: 2016-07-19 09:47

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	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

There are some typos in this manuscript. E.g., " difficulty in carrying out "; " the main pitfalls of coventional laparoscopic gastrectomy "; " the not ideal and often shallow angulation, ... ,make... "; "the intrinsic advantage of the technical charachteristics"; "Another advantages"; "long-term benefits of RAG...is".

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 27928

Title: Robot-assisted laparoscopic gastrectomy for gastric cancer

Reviewer's code: 00502831

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2016-06-27 16:09

Date reviewed: 2016-06-30 06:44

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> 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"/> Plagiarism	<input 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

So far, there are few reports about summary of scientific evidence of robotic surgery for gastric cancer. This article was well written and the authors reported past trials in detail.