

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

Manuscript NO: 68310

Title: Acute Appendicitis - Advances & Controversies

Reviewer's code: 05402068 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: MD, MSc

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: Singapore

Manuscript submission date: 2021-05-18

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-05-20 02:25

Reviewer performed review: 2021-05-20 02:30

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[Y] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[]Yes [Y]No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No



160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568 **E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite

https://www.wjgnet.com

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

It should be accepted for publication.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

Manuscript NO: 68310

Title: Acute Appendicitis - Advances & Controversies

Reviewer's code: 05130622
Position: Peer Reviewer
Academic degree: MBBS
Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United Kingdom

Author's Country/Territory: Singapore

Manuscript submission date: 2021-05-18

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-05-19 13:05

Reviewer performed review: 2021-05-28 13:06

Review time: 9 Days

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [Y] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [] Major revision [Y] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The title, abstract and key words clearly match the goal of the manuscript. The authors mention 'contact less' diagnosis within the core tip paragraph. Whilst I understand the essence of the statement, I would advise caution with this remark. This implies to a reader that the authors are suggesting that patients could undergo an imaging modality prior to being examined by a competent medical practitioner. Methods - who screened the manuscripts? Scoring systems - this section seems unnecessarily word heavy with a large amount of statistics being presented within the paragraphs. This section would be better served by describing each of the scoring systems and then presenting the specificity/sensitivity values within a table. It is too easy for a reader to lose interest when reading a long list of statistics within a paragraph. I feel that an additional paragraph is required regarding the significant differences in practice surrounding the use of imaging for appendicitis throughout the world. For example, within the UK, CT scans are rarely used for the diagnosis in the under 50 population. I acknowledge that the authors did state 'CT scan may be a more appropriate first-line investigation in The authors state that MRI is used as a first line overweight or elderly patients'. modality in children for the diagnosis of acute appendicitis. This should be referenced. It should also be expanded on the logisitical issues regarding MRI scans, particularly out of hours. This should include the challenges of performing MRI scans on younger children with regards to staying still and claustrophobia. The management section is very similar in that it is a long list of statistics from other studies. Whilst I understand the reason for this, it makes this overall paper difficult to read. The overall impression of this manuscript is one that has been well written and well researched. However, I feel that a narrative review should offer more than paragraph after paragraph of listed statistics. The authors would be well placed to narrate more around the issues, rather than list the statistical values (these can easily be placed in tables). This paper feels far



too long and would have been better placed as 2 or 3 separate review articles.



RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

Manuscript NO: 68310

Title: Acute Appendicitis – Advances & Controversies

Reviewer's code: 05130622
Position: Peer Reviewer
Academic degree: MBBS
Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United Kingdom

Author's Country/Territory: Singapore

Manuscript submission date: 2021-05-18

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ru Fan

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-07-27 09:17

Reviewer performed review: 2021-07-27 09:20

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[Y] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I would like to congratulate the authors on the changes made. I feel that the manuscript



https://www.wjgnet.com

has been significantly improved and will be a useful addition to the literature. Well done!