

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Manuscript NO:** 53431

**Title:** Clinical course of percutaneous cholecystostomies: A cross-sectional study

**Reviewer's code:** 03259574

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Professor, Research Scientist, Academic Research

**Reviewer's country:** Algeria

**Author's country:** Turkey

**Manuscript submission date:** 2019-12-19

**Reviewer chosen by:** Jie Wang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-12-22 09:50

**Reviewer performed review:** 2019-12-27 10:36

**Review time:** 5 Days

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" 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

I have read carefully the paper titled 'clinical course of percutaneous cholecystostomes' written by Dr Mesut Tez, and al . and which evaluated retrospectively the clinical course of patients who received percutaneous cholecystostomy procedure for acute cholecystitis. This work is very interesting and the whole manuscript is well drafted ; however some concerns have been noted including: 1-the abstract is less concise and should be modified particularly the conclusion undersection. 1-This material cited in result section 'Oral feeding was stopped and medical treatment with intravenous hydration and antibiotics (second-generation cephalosporin) was started for all patients. After percutaneous cholecystostomy, the following criteria were accepted as a satisfactory clinical response: good general condition, no fever, and white blood cell count decreased to the normal range. For these patients, the antibiotic treatment was terminated, and liquid feeding was started for those who did not have complaints of vomiting, lack of appetite, or distension', should be placed in methods' 3- The results were less clearly presented and modifications should be added to make result presentation more clear and easily readable . 4- The authors did not report the complications related to catheter if any. 5- The study results have been well discussed, however, in the beginning of discussion section, the authors reported an important increase in gallbladder stone after 50 years old, especially in female; however, the reference (10) is relatively outdated. So, the authors should give more recent reference with current incidence rates. 6- The most important limitations of the study should be précised especially the bias of selection that impairs the results. 6- The conclusion should be reformulated by providing a clear conclusion summarizing the study results with suggestions. 7-Some materials have been cited in both figure 1 and table 1, so, modifications are required . 8- Finally, it is very hopeful that the statistical results should be reviewed by a statistician.



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

## INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

### *Google Search:*

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

### *BPG Search:*

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

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Manuscript NO:** 53431

**Title:** Clinical course of percutaneous cholecystostomies: A cross-sectional study

**Reviewer's code:** 03261241

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

**Reviewer's country:** Japan

**Author's country:** Turkey

**Manuscript submission date:** 2019-12-19

**Reviewer chosen by:** Jie Wang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-12-22 21:23

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-01-05 11:03

**Review time:** 13 Days and 13 Hours

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" 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 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

Comments to the authors: This paper entitled 'Clinical course of percutaneous cholecystostomies' is necessary report to investigate the availability of percutaneous cholecystectomies, especially elderly or frail patients with an ASA score of  $\geq$  III. The author presents that percutaneous cholecystostomy can be considered as a safer option with a significantly lower complication rate in these patients. This report is the valuable article focused on the validity of the operation methods for acute cholecystitis. However, there are several important criticisms as follows. Comments: 1. Some papers have been already published about the availability of percutaneous cholecystectomies for high risk patients. The author should mention about the original findings of this paper to Abstract and Manuscript. 2. It is recommended to add the definition of 'percutaneous cholecystectomy' on the beginning of this manuscript, a technique that consists of percutaneous catheter placement in the gallbladder lumen under imaging guidance, has become an alternative to surgical cholecystostomy. 3. If possible, please describe the reason that interval cholecystectomy couldn't be performed not only  $>$  ASA Score III. Please provide the criteria to perform interval cholecystectomy at your hospital, the detailed cause, underlying disease or pre-operative test (cardiac or respiratory function test). 4. Though author describe that the catheter removal time was determined after consultation with a radiologist on postoperative days three or four, please explain about the validity of this time. 5. Could you teach about the cases who were performed percutaneous transhepatic gallbladder aspiration or Endoscopic retrograde gallbladder drainage. 6. If you use the abbreviation for percutaneous cholecystectomies (PC) or acute cholecystitis (AC) at Abstract, I recommend that you should use the abbreviation at main manuscript, too. 7. Please write the P-value correctly (RESULT of page 2 or page 6),  $P: 0.0001 \rightarrow P = 0.0001$  and  $P: 0.025 \rightarrow P = 0.025$  8. Please change the number to the character (Page 6-line 7 and Page 7-line 15 ), 13 $\rightarrow$ thirteen and 12 $\rightarrow$ twelve. 9. You should added the period on the sentence (Page



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

8-line 17).

#### **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

##### ***Google Search:***

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

##### ***BPG Search:***

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

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Manuscript NO:** 53431

**Title:** Clinical course of percutaneous cholecystostomies: A cross-sectional study

**Reviewer's code:** 03031354

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** DNB, MBBS, MD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

**Reviewer's country:** India

**Author's country:** Turkey

**Manuscript submission date:** 2019-12-19

**Reviewer chosen by:** Jie Wang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-12-25 00:35

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-01-06 05:44

**Review time:** 12 Days and 5 Hours

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" 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

The authors have presented and discussed in this retrospective review the treatment of Ac cholecystitis by percutaneous cholecystostomy in patients with high risk for surgery. Overall the article is well written and will add to the already available literature on this issue. I have some observations 1. The abstract is sketchy especially the results and conclusions section. These could be elaborated and redrafted. 2. In methodology, the authors should specify their protocol regarding timing of cholecystostomy catheter removal. The timing of the same in the article has been variable and seems to be much earlier (as early as 4 days!) than what has been recommended in literature. What findings on the repeat ultrasound determined the catheter removal? They should also mention as to what their protocol is regarding the follow-up treatment of these patients - whether they mandatorily recommend interval cholecystectomy (Bridging procedure) or would only do so in cases with recurrent cholecystitis. do the authors suggest that this could be a definitive modality of treatment? 3. In the results section, Most of the first paragraph should be shifted to the methodology section.

#### **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

##### ***Google Search:***

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

##### ***BPG Search:***

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism





**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](http://www.wjgnet.com)

[ Y ] No

## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Manuscript NO:** 53431

**Title:** Clinical course of percutaneous cholecystostomies: A cross-sectional study

**Reviewer's code:** 03031354

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** DNB, MBBS, MD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

**Reviewer's country:** India

**Author's country:** Turkey

**Manuscript submission date:** 2019-12-19

**Reviewer chosen by:** Ying Dou

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-03-12 10:48

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-03-13 13:24

**Review time:** 1 Day and 2 Hours

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input checked="" 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 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



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

Nil

#### **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

##### ***Google Search:***

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

##### ***BPG Search:***

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