Reviewer Assessment **Open Access**

Hiroshi Kawamoto, Takahisa Fujikawa* and Akira Tanaka

Successful resection of pancreatic head cancer in a patient with circumportal pancreas: a case report with technical consideration

DOI 10.1515/iss-2017-0003
Received December 30, 2016; accepted January 19, 2017

***Corresponding author: Takahisa Fujikawa,**
Department of Surgery, Kokura Memorial Hospital, 3-2-1, Asano, Kokurakita-ku, Kitakyushu, Fukuoka 802-8555, Japan,
E-mail: fujikawa-t@kokurakinen.or.jp

Reviewers' Comments to Original Submission

Reviewer 1: Sören T. Mees

Jan 05, 2017

Reviewer Recommendation Term:	Accept with Minor Revision
Overall Reviewer Manuscript Rating:	60

Custom Review Questions	**Response**
Is the subject area appropriate for you?	5 - High/Yes
Does the title clearly reflect the paper's content?	5 - High/Yes
Does the abstract clearly reflect the paper's content?	4
Do the keywords clearly reflect the paper's content?	5 - High/Yes
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?	N/A
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?	4
Please rate the practical significance.	2
Please rate the accuracy of methods.	N/A
Please rate the statistical evaluation and quality control.	N/A
Please rate the appropriateness of the figures and tables.	4
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:

The authors present a case report dealing with a resection of a pancreatic head cancer in a patient with circumportal pancreas. A circumportal pancreas is rare but its handling during surgery is important for HPB surgeons. Therefore, the case report is of interest for a medium-sized readership. Although there are some case reports/ studies listed in pubmed dealing with this topic, the surgical treatment has not been described in detail so far. Thus, I consider this case report as suitable for publication in ISS.

Minor issues:
- The paper should be revised by a native speaker as it contains errors in grammar and syntax
e.g. But this procedure --have-- a disadvantage --that-- it needs additional dissection or resection and, as a result, may cause secondary damages, and --also have one that-- the cutting plane at the pancreas body may be larger than that on SMV/PV. Moreover, the deterioration in the remnant pancreas function may be --concerned--.
- Case report, p3, last sentence: Why was the patient discharged on POD36 in an uneventful postopearive course?
- Please consider the citation of the following literature as it may add valuable information for the reader: PMID 27826941 (surgical treatment!) / 25626884 / 25248793

Reviewer 2: Markus K. Diener

Jan 04, 2017

Reviewer Recommendation Term:	Accept with Minor Revision
Overall Reviewer Manuscript Rating:	70

Custom Review Questions	**Response**
Is the subject area appropriate for you?	5 - High/Yes
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?	4
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?	3
How adequate is the data presentation?	3
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?	5 - High/Yes
Does the reader get new insights from the article?	4
Please rate the practical significance.	3
Please rate the accuracy of methods.	N/A
Please rate the statistical evaluation and quality control.	N/A
Please rate the appropriateness of the figures and tables.	4
Please rate the appropriateness of the references.	2
Please evaluate the writing style and use of language.	2
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 case of a patient undergoing pancreatoduodenectomy with the intraoperative finding of retroportal pancreas. This case Report is interesting, since rare findings in surgery must be published in such a way. However, please allow me several comments:
1. Grammar and style has to be corrected; suggest to involve a native Speaker
2. It is not clear enough, if the finding of a retroportal pancreas was known preoperatively. The authors say so, but why didn't they dissect the pancreas on a plane left to the portal vein?
3. Since this anatomical variation is rare; the authors should precisely display the available evidence within this topic. I definitively appreciate the technical remarks, but however, the authors should go into the literature and Report complications and fistula rates after the reported technical variations (if available).

Authors' Response to Reviewer Comments

Jan 12, 2017

Thank you for your January 6th letter according to our manuscript entitled, "Successful resection of pancreatic head cancer in a patient with circumportal pancreas: a case report with technical consideration" (Manuscript ID ISS-2017-0003).
I prepared herein our revised manuscript including figures. Our incorporation of the reviewer's suggestion is as follows:
#1
1) Regarding the comments of the reviewer concerning linguistic/stylistic problems, I wholly checked the manuscript and modified accordingly.
2) According to the reviewer's comment, we added an explanation for the reason of the prolonged hospital stay.
3) According to the reviewer's suggestion, we added the citation of the literature.
#2
1) Same as #1- 1)
2) According to the reviewer's comment, we added an explanation for the reason of not choosing the method of cutting the pancreas on a plane left to the portal vein.
3) According to the review's comment, we added an explanation and a table about the relationship between the technical variations and POPF.

I believe the manuscript has been improved satisfactory and hope it will be accepted for publication in Innovative Surgical Sciences.
Sincerely

Reviewers' Comments to Revision

Reviewer 1: Sören T. Mees

Jan 18, 2017

Reviewer Recommendation Term:	Accept
Overall Reviewer Manuscript Rating:	60

Custom Review Questions	**Response**
Is the subject area appropriate for you?	3
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?	4
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?	4
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.	3
Please rate the accuracy of methods.	4
Please rate the statistical evaluation and quality control.	N/A
Please rate the appropriateness of the figures and tables.	4

Please rate the appropriateness of the references.	4
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:
-

Reviewer 2: Markus K. Diener

Jan 17, 2017

Reviewer Recommendation Term:	Accept
Overall Reviewer Manuscript Rating:	70

Custom Review Questions	**Response**
Is the subject area appropriate for you?	5 - High/Yes
Does the title clearly reflect the paper's content?	5 - High/Yes
Does the abstract clearly reflect the paper's content?	4
Do the keywords clearly reflect the paper's content?	5 - High/Yes
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?	5 - High/Yes
Does the reader get new insights from the article?	4
Please rate the practical significance.	4
Please rate the accuracy of methods.	N/A
Please rate the statistical evaluation and quality control.	N/A
Please rate the appropriateness of the figures and tables.	5 - High/Yes
Please rate the appropriateness of the references.	4
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:
The authors responded adequately to the peer Review comments, and therefore the manuscript was improved significantly.