



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https:// www.wjgnet.com

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 39878

Title: An algorithm for multidisciplinary management of hemorrhage

Reviewer's code: 03479389

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Jin-Lei Wang

Date sent for review: 2018-05-21

Date reviewed: 2018-05-21

Review time: 12 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you for giving me an opportunity of the review. My comments are as follows.

This is a well written. Please add the clinical outcomes between cautery dilator and non-cautery dilator in bleeding of EUS-guided PFC drainage.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https:// www.wjgnet.com

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 39878

Title: An algorithm for multidisciplinary management of hemorrhage

Reviewer's code: 00504708

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Jin-Lei Wang

Date sent for review: 2018-06-12

Date reviewed: 2018-06-12

Review time: 1 Hour

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors should be commended on there truly excellent review of hemorrhage related to EUS-guided PFC drainage. The major criticism is that the English is poor. I realize that this is not the authors' native language, but the awkward semantics may distort points that the authors trying to convey. For instance, "coagulation disorders are

a dangerous cause of hemorrhage in which case conservative treatment is" "we supposed at the type of pancreatic collection is related to the recurrence of bleeding due to different components in the intraluminal" severe-not "sever" I would just get a capable English proofreader and you are set! The review was comprehensive and there is little I can criticize regarding the intellectual content. Some points that could be better covered include the use of EUS Doppler and the effect of angle of the transducer on Doppler signal. There is controversy in the West guarding removal of LAMS in that a decompressed PFC may predispose to stent erosion into an artery. Again the review was excellent and reflects a great deal of effort!

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https:// www.wjgnet.com

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 39878

Title: An algorithm for multidisciplinary management of hemorrhage

Reviewer's code: 00074961

Reviewer's country: Spain

Science editor: Jin-Lei Wang

Date sent for review: 2018-06-12

Date reviewed: 2018-06-19

Review time: 7 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

You should re-write your title; it does not reflect the main subject of the manuscript. "An algorithm for multidisciplinary management of hemorrhage...relating to what disease? You should not spend so much effort on the first items (definitions, classification, imaging techniques...) because they are not the main aim of the work. The same for

tables 1, 2 and 3 (for example, the only relevant point here is bleeding definition); I am not sure they are necessary. Perhaps you should focus on the aim of your study: hemorrhage in EUS-guided drainage for PFC. It would be interesting if you comment bleeding risk when endoscopic debridement through LAMS? I would remove “Over the last three decades...the first-line treatment for PFC” (last paragraph). Be aware with spelling: Fig 1: Space between tail and (arrow); The same between deployment and (arrow). Fig 2: “serverity”, “sever”, “stents erodin”...

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No