

Reviewer Assessment

Open Access

Stefan Heinrich and Hauke Lang*

Hepatic resection for primary and secondary liver malignancies

DOI 10.1515/iss-2017-0009

Received February 1, 2017; accepted February 20, 2017

*Corresponding author: Hauke Lang,

Klinik für Allgemein-, Viszeral- und Transplantationschirurgie, Universitätsmedizin Mainz, Langenbeckstrasse 1, 55131 Mainz, Germany,
E-mail: hauke.lang@unimedizin-mainz.de

Reviewers' Comments to Original Submission

Reviewer 1: Andreas Schnitzbauer

Feb 16, 2017

Reviewer Recommendation Term:	Accept
Overall Reviewer Manuscript Rating:	75
Custom Review Questions	Response
Is the subject area appropriate for you?	4
Does the title clearly reflect the paper's content?	4
Does the abstract clearly reflect the paper's content?	4
Do the keywords clearly reflect the paper's content?	1 - Low/No
Does the introduction present the problem clearly?	4
Are the results/conclusions justified?	4
How comprehensive and up-to-date is the subject matter presented?	4
How adequate is the data presentation?	4
Are units and terminology used correctly?	4
Is the number of cases adequate?	N/A
Are the experimental methods/clinical studies adequate?	N/A
Is the length appropriate in relation to the content?	4
Does the reader get new insights from the article?	3
Please rate the practical significance.	4
Please rate the accuracy of methods.	3
Please rate the statistical evaluation and quality control.	N/A
Please rate the appropriateness of the figures and tables.	3
Please rate the appropriateness of the references.	4
Please evaluate the writing style and use of language.	4
Please judge the overall scientific quality of the manuscript.	3
Are you willing to review the revision of this manuscript?	Yes

Comments to Authors:

The authors present a nice overview of state of the art liver surgery as comprehensive review. The most recent developments are depicted. Primary and secondary developments are sufficiently worked up. With this review it is easy to get an impression of the latest standards in hepatic surgery. Innovative surgical science is the appropriate journal for the review.

Reviewer 2: Peter Schemmer

Feb 10, 2017

Reviewer Recommendation Term:

Reject

Overall Reviewer Manuscript Rating:

N/A

Custom Review Questions**Response**

Is the subject area appropriate for you?	5 - High/Yes
Does the title clearly reflect the paper's content?	1 - Low/No
Does the abstract clearly reflect the paper's content?	1 - Low/No
Do the keywords clearly reflect the paper's content?	1 - Low/No
Does the introduction present the problem clearly?	1 - Low/No
Are the results/conclusions justified?	1 - Low/No
How comprehensive and up-to-date is the subject matter presented?	1 - Low/No
How adequate is the data presentation?	1 - Low/No
Are units and terminology used correctly?	1 - Low/No
Is the number of cases adequate?	1 - Low/No
Are the experimental methods/clinical studies adequate?	1 - Low/No
Is the length appropriate in relation to the content?	1 - Low/No
Does the reader get new insights from the article?	2
Please rate the practical significance.	1 - Low/No
Please rate the accuracy of methods.	1 - Low/No
Please rate the statistical evaluation and quality control.	1 - Low/No
Please rate the appropriateness of the figures and tables.	1 - Low/No
Please rate the appropriateness of the references.	1 - Low/No
Please evaluate the writing style and use of language.	1 - Low/No
Please judge the overall scientific quality of the manuscript.	1 - Low/No
Are you willing to review the revision of this manuscript?	Yes

Comments to Authors:

Thank you very much for giving me the opportunity to review this manuscript. The presented manuscript addresses a major topic, of interest for a wide audience. Liver resection is the treatment of choice for patients suffering from primary or secondary liver malignancies. Despite this fact no review summary exists on this topic.

Unfortunately, although being of interest, the presented manuscript has several flaws that need to be addressed before submitted again.

Major concerns:

- * The authors aim to present a narrative review. The style the manuscript is written in, more presents a narration than a scientific presentation and lacks structure. It seems like a compilation of different chapters and ideas.
 - * A concise literature search is lacking and needs to be performed. The references lack different important publications on the issues addressed. This needs to be redone therefore.
 - * The abstract does not seem to be an abstract but parts of the manuscript being copy pasted
 - * The language needs extensive editing and rephrasing by an English native speaker
 - * The images seem to be of the contributors own patients. Either the manuscript is rewritten and compiles the cases besides a structured literature review or the images need to be removed.
 - * The manuscript needs to be divided into common sections: Introduction - Literature Search - Review
 - * The reasons why the authors did not perform a meta analysis needs to be given. As there are various publications on the addressed topic, a meta analysis would be feasible pooling different papers on the same outcome
-

Reviewer 3: Hans-Joachim Meyer

Feb 18, 2017

Reviewer Recommendation Term:	Accept
Overall Reviewer Manuscript Rating:	N/A
Custom Review Questions	Response
Is the subject area appropriate for you?	3
Does the title clearly reflect the paper's content?	3
Does the abstract clearly reflect the paper's content?	3
Do the keywords clearly reflect the paper's content?	3
Does the introduction present the problem clearly?	3
Are the results/conclusions justified?	3
How comprehensive and up-to-date is the subject matter presented?	3
How adequate is the data presentation?	3
Are units and terminology used correctly?	3
Is the number of cases adequate?	3
Are the experimental methods/clinical studies adequate?	3
Is the length appropriate in relation to the content?	3
Does the reader get new insights from the article?	3
Please rate the practical significance.	3
Please rate the accuracy of methods.	3
Please rate the statistical evaluation and quality control.	3
Please rate the appropriateness of the figures and tables.	3
Please rate the appropriateness of the references.	3
Please evaluate the writing style and use of language.	3
Please judge the overall scientific quality of the manuscript.	3
Are you willing to review the revision of this manuscript?	Yes
Comments to Authors:	
No comments at all.	
