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 Gastroenterology
ESPS manuscript NO: 29152
Title: Protocol for laparoscopic cholecystectomy: Is it rocket science?
Reviewer's code: 02554592
Reviewer's country: China
Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong
Date sent for review: 2016-08-02 19:53
Date reviewed: 2016-08-16 09:35

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] The same title	[ ] High priority for publication
[Y] 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

It is a well writing review which may beneficial surgeon and patients.Almost every aspect of LC has been described.However it seems just the summarize of the authors' experience as there was no data which can show us the benefits of following the protocol for laparoscopic cholecystectomy,for example,the decrease of conversion rate,the decrease of injury rate. It will be better that more positive data can be added.

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 Gastroenterology
ESPS manuscript NO: 29152
Title: Protocol for laparoscopic cholecystectomy: Is it rocket science?
Reviewer's code: 02550913
Reviewer's country: Israel
Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong
Date sent for review: 2016-08-02 19:53
Date reviewed: 2016-10-03 15:08

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[Y] 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
[Y] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	[ ] Plagiarism	[ ] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	[Y] Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I have read with great interest the review entitled "Protocol for laparoscopic cholecystectomy: Is it rocket science?" by Hori et al. In this review the authors describe 8 tips or steps for safe lap cholecystectomy. The authors take great length at their description of the steps and conclude by presenting their experience with 30 open and laparoscopic surgeries. Although this is a detailed review I have several important comments: 1. The authors describe very detailed procedure but do not explain or give data for every single step. The authors have to address each step and discuss the existing literature or is this step based on their own experience. One cannot mix recommendations that are evidence based with recommendations that are based on personal experience. The reader must be able to distinguish which is which. For example, does the use of a flexible scope give any advantaged over an angled (30 or 45) scope? Is there any literature to support this? What about a 5 or 10 mm scope? There is some literature that needs to be referenced. Another example is the use of gauze. Is that recommended for every procedure? Is this evidence based? 2. The authors use flexible scopes – this is not readily available at all institutions. In fact, most institutions do no use flexible scopes for laparoscopy. Please acknowledge. 3. The discussion on

intra-operative cholangiogram is minimal and does not cite the relevant literature (lots of papers on this topic). Using dye is interesting but is there any evidence to support it? The dye does not give a graph of the entire biliary tree (intrahepatic). 4. The section on the results of 30 open and 30 lap procedures has no scientific value and does not belong in a review paper. 5. Figures 4 and 5 include several figures that are not related to another (as opposed to figures 1 to 3 that present a sequence of events). This is very confusing. Many figures are redundant and should be omitted. 6.

There are far too many abbreviations to the extent that certain sentences include 6 or 7 different abbreviations. This makes the text very hard to read and follow. Please limit your manuscript to very few abbreviations. 7.This is a very lengthy review (41 pages!!). Some if the text is repetitive. I strongly recommend shortening it significantly to no more than 25-30 pages in total including front page and references.

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 Gastroenterology
ESPS manuscript NO: 29152
Title: Protocol for laparoscopic cholecystectomy: Is it rocket science?
Reviewer's code: 02824253
Reviewer's country: Australia
Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong
Date sent for review: 2016-08-02 19:53
Date reviewed: 2016-09-24 12:08

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[Y] Accept
[Y] 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

Extensive review of techniques of laparoscopic cholecystectomy Good tips to avoid bile duct injury from a centre's experience Very nice drawings

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 Gastroenterology
ESPS manuscript NO: 29152
Title: Protocol for laparoscopic cholecystectomy: Is it rocket science?
Reviewer's code: 03479640
Reviewer's country: United States
Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong
Date sent for review: 2016-08-02 19:53
Date reviewed: 2016-09-26 07:06

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[Y] 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

Very good and elegant review of Laparoscopic cholecystectomy technique. The drawings and illustrations add merit to this review. On Page 7, the authors mention that the gall bladder fundus is retracted superiorly and cranially. For worldwide readers, it would be more accurate and easier to understand, if this could be changed to cranially and towards right shoulder.