

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 85714

Title: Laparoscopic vs open radical resection in the management of gallbladder carcinoma: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06286982

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-05-20

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-05-20 13:20

Reviewer performed review: 2023-05-20 13:29

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 Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" 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

Dear Editor, thank you so much for inviting me to revise this manuscript about gallbladder cancer. This study addresses a current topic. The manuscript is quite well written and organized. English should be improved. Figures and tables are comprehensive and clear. The introduction explains in a clear and coherent manner the background of this study. We suggest the following modifications:

- Introduction section: although the authors correctly included important papers in this setting, we the systemic treatment scenario for gallbladder cancer and biliary tract tumors should be briefly discussed and some recently published papers added within the introduction (PMID: 32806956 ; PMID: 32994319; PMID: 33592561; PMID: 36633661), only for a matter of consistency. We think it might be useful to introduce the topic of this interesting study.

- Methods and Statistical Analysis: nothing to add.
- Discussion section: Very interesting and timely discussion. Of note, the authors should expand the Discussion section, including a more personal perspective to reflect on. For example, they could answer the following questions – in order to facilitate the understanding of this complex topic to readers: what potential does this study hold? What are the knowledge gaps and



**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>

how do researchers tackle them? How do you see this area unfolding in the next 5 years? We think it would be extremely interesting for the readers. However, we think the authors should be acknowledged for their work. In fact, they correctly addressed an important topic, the methods sound good and their discussion is well balanced. One additional little flaw: the authors could better explain the limitations of their work, in the last part of the Discussion. We believe this article is suitable for publication in the journal although some revisions are needed. The main strengths of this paper are that it addresses an interesting and very timely question and provides a clear answer, with some limitations. We suggest a linguistic revision and the addition of some references for a matter of consistency. Moreover, the authors should better clarify some points.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 85714

Title: Laparoscopic vs open radical resection in the management of gallbladder carcinoma: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02510721

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Full Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-05-20

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-06-06 06:14

Reviewer performed review: 2023-06-14 16:37

Review time: 8 Days and 10 Hours

Scientific quality	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="radio"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="radio"/> Grade C: Good <input type="radio"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="radio"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="radio"/> Grade B: Good <input type="radio"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="radio"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="radio"/> Grade B: Good <input type="radio"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="radio"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input 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
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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

Gallbladder carcinoma The Abstract summarizes the contents of the study. The Introduction is correct. However, I have the suggestion of adding the pathological classification of gallbladder carcinoma, albeit in a very concise form. In the Materials and methods section, the subsections Search strategy and study selection, Study selection, Data extraction and outcome measures, Statistical analysis, Subgroup analysis, Risk of Bias are presented in detail. All subsections clearly set out the programme, objectives and related calculations. The results of the meta-analysis are presented in great detail for all identified subsections and are shown to be credible. The Discussion illustrates the results of this meta-analysis. However, it presents an interesting observation on the correctness of including studies in previous meta-analyses which would not have put the results of the comparison in terms of radical resection in the right light. The observations on previous studies are appreciable. The conclusions fully correspond with the objectives and results of the present meta-analysis. References are appropriate and up to



**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

date.

The Figures and Tables are clear and useful for understanding the results

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 85714

Title: Laparoscopic vs open radical resection in the management of gallbladder carcinoma: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06286982

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-05-20

Reviewer chosen by: Xin-Liang Qu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-06-30 08:52

Reviewer performed review: 2023-06-30 08:54

Review time: 1 Hour

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



**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>

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

acceptance.