

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Methodology

ESPS manuscript NO: 19356

Title: Laparoscopic surgery: A qualified systematic review

Reviewer's code: 02520738

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2015-05-08 08:28

Date reviewed: 2015-05-09 17:06

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 type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" 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

To: Lian-Sheng Ma President and Company Editor-in-Chief World Journal of Methodology Title: "Laparoscopic surgery: a qualified systematic review" Dear Editor, We have read through the manuscript and we think that some points should be re-considered: - The authors stated that this is a systematic review but some points about systematic review should be better evaluated: ? A figure resembling the number excluded and included studies should be introduced. ? Inclusion and exclusion criteria should be considered. ? A table gathering the main findings of the considered studies should be introduced. ? There is no statistical evaluation comparing the data from the previous studies ? All these considerations make such a manuscript a simple review rather than a "systematic" one. Please discuss such a point. - An English revision should be considered in order to overcome typos. - A representative figure should be considered in order to give a better representation of the contents of the text.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Methodology

ESPS manuscript NO: 19356

Title: Laparoscopic surgery: A qualified systematic review

Reviewer's code: 02510721

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2015-05-08 08:28

Date reviewed: 2015-05-31 17:54

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 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"/> 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

This study was well conducted with very great exam of the recent literature about the laparoscopic surgery. Therefore this review shows a complete scenario of the most frequent procedures of digestive diseases performed with a new miniinvasive approach. I can mark only an omission, in the liver surgery should be inserted the laparoscopic approach for donors in liver transplantation. Nevertheless the final consideration points out that all contents of the review are very well known for general/digestive surgeons and are few interesting.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Methodology

ESPS manuscript NO: 19356

Title: Laparoscopic surgery: A qualified systematic review

Reviewer's code: 02508408

Reviewer's country: Taiwan

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2015-05-08 08:28

Date reviewed: 2015-05-28 02:13

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

This is a well-written review article on the topic of laparoscopic surgery. The content of the manuscript is clinically relevant, the information presented is well-organized, and the literature search is thorough. I would recommend acceptance of the article.