

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

Manuscript NO: 72958

Title: Are laparoscopic cholecystectomy and natural orifice transluminal endoscopic surgery gallbladder preserving cholecystolithotomy truly comparable? A propensity matched study

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03261315

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: FACE, PhD

Professional title: Academic Research, Chief Doctor, Doctor, Postdoc, Reader (Associate Professor), Senior Researcher

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Romania

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-11-06

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-11-27 15:23

Reviewer performed review: 2021-12-05 17:48

Review time: 8 Days and 2 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection

Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I reviewed a retrospective study which compared the NOTES with laparoscopic cholecystectomy. The authors matched 95 patients from each group. The study seems very appealing. The title and introduction have been well chosen. I have some comments regarding the methods. The authors found out a high risk of biliary peritonitis in NOTES group (12 patients from 95) . Therefore they change the protocol of NOTES using abdominal irrigation. In my opinion they have 2 options: either they exclude the first 12 patients and included in the study only 82 patients or they assume a high rate of severe complications as biliary peritonitis in NOTES group. If they agree the last option, they should change the results and conclusions.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

Manuscript NO: 72958

Title: Are laparoscopic cholecystectomy and natural orifice transluminal endoscopic surgery gallbladder preserving cholecystolithotomy truly comparable? A propensity matched study

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03669557

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: FACS, MD, PhD

Professional title: Doctor, Lecturer, Postdoc, Research Assistant Professor, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-11-06

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-12-09 17:21

Reviewer performed review: 2021-12-09 18:04

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection



**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>

Re-review	[<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] Anonymous [<input type="checkbox"/>] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [<input type="checkbox"/>] Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Interesting topic, experimentation is always welcome, as long as patients are well informed, and it seems that the authors have done so. The manuscript is fluid, well structured and easy to read. The variables chosen for comparison are acceptable. The figures and tables are of good quality. Most of the references are dated, but there are some quite recent. The supplementary material and the video are of good quality. In my opinion the manuscript can be accepted for publication

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

Manuscript NO: 72958

Title: Are laparoscopic cholecystectomy and natural orifice transluminal endoscopic surgery gallbladder preserving cholecystolithotomy truly comparable? A propensity matched study

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03261315

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: FACE, PhD

Professional title: Academic Research, Chief Doctor, Doctor, Postdoc, Reader (Associate Professor), Senior Researcher

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Romania

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-11-06

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ru Fan

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-01-21 08:27

Reviewer performed review: 2022-01-21 09:02

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection



**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>

Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Well and clearly written paper. I have a small comments: regarding the NOTES technique, please explain how the tip of endoscop was insert in the gallbladder? And how many passes do you need to extract the stones ? Please add the median time lenght spent per NOTES. I did not find any tables or figures attached to the main text