



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 Transplantation

ESPS manuscript NO: 24965

Title: Exocrine drainage in vascularized pancreas transplantation in the new millennium

Reviewer's code: 00503243

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2016-02-16 18:02

Date reviewed: 2016-02-19 18:10

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

The authors extensively describe the story concerning the last decades of the exocrine drainage in vascularized pancreas transplantation. The manuscript is well written and complete. I do not have any specific comments



ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Transplantation

ESPS manuscript NO: 24965

Title: Exocrine drainage in vascularized pancreas transplantation in the new millennium

Reviewer’s code: 00504392

Reviewer’s country: Germany

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2016-02-16 18:02

Date reviewed: 2016-02-19 23:53

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 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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

ESPS WJT 24965 Reviewer code 00504392 General The number of pancreas transplants is decreasing although the technique and outcome dramatically improved. Why is that ? Suggestions 1. The text could be made shorter since most information is also in the tables. 2. The information on outcome would be easier to apprehend when given as figures. Special Abstract, Paragraph 2: The first 3 sentences could be cancelled to make the abstract more concise. Introduction, Paragraph 1: Again the first 3 sentences might not be needed. Page 6, Paragraph 2, Lines 2 and 8: There is a repetition "... rejection ..." and again "... rejection ..." - make it short. Page 7, Paragraph 2: The first 2 sentences might not be needed. Page 14, Paragraph 2: Really needed ? Say Boggi et al not Boggi, et al. ... Table 2 and 5 might not be needed since the information on advantages and disadvantages is stated also in the text.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Transplantation

ESPS manuscript NO: 24965

Title: Exocrine drainage in vascularized pancreas transplantation in the new millennium

Reviewer's code: 00005191

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2016-02-16 18:02

Date reviewed: 2016-02-20 19:29

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 type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 purpose of this review is to examine the existing literature on exocrine drainage in the past 20 years with an emphasis on surgical aspects, technical modifications and nuances that have been introduced over time and with experience in pancreas transplantation. Advantages and disadvantages, side effects and late complications of both enteric drainage and bladder drainage are listed in details, with the aid of tables. The re-emergence of primary enteric drainage as an alternative to bladder drainage is discussed even though the incidence and outcomes associated with surgical complications following enteric drainage are similar to those following bladder drainage and the rates of early graft loss with either technique are comparable. Also, the Authors illustrate the characteristics of a surgical technique of intraperitoneal portal venous drainage that uses the superior mesenteric vein and was developed and refined combining portal venous delivery of insulin with enteric drainage of the exocrine secretions (portal-enteric technique). Laparoscopic pancreas transplantation under robotic assistance is one of the most recent and exciting innovations in pancreas transplantation and is briefly mentioned by the Authors. Although numerous variations exist in the basic surgical techniques of pancreas transplantation and nuances continue to be



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>

described, current philosophy dictates that the most appropriate technique to be performed is the one with which the individual surgeon feels most comfortable based on donor pancreas quality and recipient anatomic considerations. The take-home message of the manuscript is that, thanks to improved surgical outcomes, exocrine drainage techniques are no longer the “Achilles’ heel” of vascularized pancreas transplantation. The paper is well-written and researched. It can be a useful review for pancreas surgeons. It should be published as it is, maybe after adding more comments and details regarding the most recent surgical innovations.



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 Transplantation

ESPS manuscript NO: 24965

Title: Exocrine drainage in vascularized pancreas transplantation in the new millennium

Reviewer's code: 00504647

Reviewer's country: Poland

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2016-02-16 18:02

Date reviewed: 2016-02-25 20:21

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input 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"/> 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

This is extensive, well written review of surgical techniques of exocrine drainage in vascularized pancreas transplantation. My only criticism is lack of figures which might help nonsurgeons reading the paper.



ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Transplantation

ESPS manuscript NO: 24965

Title: Exocrine drainage in vascularized pancreas transplantation in the new millennium

Reviewer’s code: 00070502

Reviewer’s country: China

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2016-02-16 18:02

Date reviewed: 2016-02-26 16:38

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"/> 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 review “Exocrine drainage in vascularized pancreas transplantation in the new millennium” examined the existing literatures on exocrine drainage with an emphasis on surgical aspects, technical modifications and nuances that have been introduced over time. The systemic-bladder technique, systemic-enteric technique and portal-enteric technique have been described in details. The manuscript has been written well. 1, the authors described the surgical techniques with language. From my side, I prefer to figures which are much easier to describe the surgery and the progress. 2, under the setting of either systemic-bladder technique or systemic-enteric technique, bleeding at the site of anastomosis is a severe complication. I suggest the authors to give more detail on this complication (the rate, diagnose, treatment and prognosis with a compare between the two techniques).