BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC
8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242 Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Surgical Procedures
ESPS manuscript NO: 22480
Title: Review of intraoperative parathormone monitoring with the miami criterion: A 25-year experience
Reviewer's code: 03289068
Reviewer's country: Italy
Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji
Date sent for review: 2015-09-06 09:52
Date reviewed: 2015-10-01 15:45

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[Y] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] The same title	[ ] High priority for publication
[ ] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Duplicate publication	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	[ ] Plagiarism	[Y] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	[ ] Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear sirs, I was pleased to review your paper "Intraoperative Parathormone Monitoring with the Miami Criterion: A 25-year experience". Indeed it is very up-to-date and the "historic perspective" is very interesting. Still I'd suggest few simple changes before pubblication: 1. It is not clear to me if this is a retrospective cohort study (as the title would make me believe), a narrative review (as I assume), a systematic review (as a "review" may be) or a case-series (three cases described). As it looks like a narrative review, I'd suggest to change the title to make clear that this is not a retrospective cohort analysis (for example, but feel free to come up with something better: "Is the Miami Criterion for Intraoperative Parathormone Monitoring still up-to-date 25 years after its definition?"). 2. I know it doesn't really matter in clinical practice, but I'm curious about which PTH assay was first developed by dr. Irvin and which one is used nowadays (whole PTH vs. intact PTH vs. third gen assay?). I would also like a brief comment on Point of Care (PoC) PTH assays: do you use them? Why you do or don't? I think this could go in the "Miami criterion" paragraph 3. Abstract: a little more detail (ie: success rate) and focus on the Miami criterion (ie: definition and brief

comparison with other criteria) would be welcome. 4. I do not get how the first "example case" is different from the second one: if there are no major differences, delete either one. If there are differences worth to be noted, please point them out more clearly. 5. The mention of other criteria (Rome and Vienna) is very short: I'd really appreciate a more detailed comparison between the Miami criterion and these other criteria. 6. As a side note, please check that abbreviations are defined at their first use (ie: MIBI has been used in page 8 twice, but "explained" only in page 10; MGD was never stated to stand for multi-glandular disease, and so on) and check that all figures are referenced in the text.

BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC
8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242 Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Surgical Procedures
ESPS manuscript NO: 22480
Title: Review of intraoperative parathormone monitoring with the miami criterion: A 25-year experience
Reviewer's code: 00159662
Reviewer's country: Greece
Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji
Date sent for review: 2015-09-06 09:52
Date reviewed: 2015-10-13 15:33

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[Y] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[Y] Accept
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] The same title	[ ] High priority for publication
[ ] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Duplicate publication	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	[ ] Plagiarism	[ ] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	[ ] Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

A well-written manuscript