

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**Manuscript NO:** 34650

**Title:** Laparoscopic appendectomy for acute appendicitis: How to discourage surgeons using inadequate therapy

**Reviewer's code:** 02728137

**Reviewer's country:** Georgia

**Science editor:** Ze-Mao Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2017-05-16

**Date reviewed:** 2017-05-19

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Authors, It is a nice job. It is written well. I read the manuscript attentively and have some comments. Please, find the attached file with my comments.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**Manuscript NO:** 34650

**Title:** Laparoscopic appendectomy for acute appendicitis: How to discourage surgeons using inadequate therapy

**Reviewer's code:** 03317059

**Reviewer's country:** Turkey

**Science editor:** Ze-Mao Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2017-05-16

**Date reviewed:** 2017-05-21

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Certificate of English Editing taken for another study. Contribution to the science is poor.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**Manuscript NO:** 34650

**Title:** Laparoscopic appendectomy for acute appendicitis: How to discourage surgeons using inadequate therapy

**Reviewer's code:** 02839880

**Reviewer's country:** Italy

**Science editor:** Ze-Mao Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2017-05-16

**Date reviewed:** 2017-05-23

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a very interesting paper on the role of laparoscopic appendectomy for acute appendicitis. In general the manuscript is good; English language is adequate. Please check throughout the text for grammar and spelling errors (e.g. in page 1 please correct the following citation: "Tomohide Hori. Laparoscopic appendectomy for acute appendicitis"; please correct the title of the paragraphs: "RESIDENTS' PERFORMANCE OF LA"; "COST EFFECTIVENESS", etc). The figures are very clear and useful. I would suggest to include more references on the management of appendicitis in the text (e.g. Agresta F, J Laparoendosc Adv Surg Tech A. 2004 Feb;14(1):1-8; Di Saverio S, World J Emerg Surg. 2016 Jul 18;11:34; Biondi A, World J Emerg Surg. 2016 Aug 30;11(1):44.) Also, I would include a statement in the conclusion paragraph on the future direction of laparoscopic appendectomy.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**Manuscript NO:** 34650

**Title:** Laparoscopic appendectomy for acute appendicitis: How to discourage surgeons using inadequate therapy

**Reviewer's code:** 00919923

**Reviewer's country:** South Korea

**Science editor:** Ze-Mao Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2017-05-16

**Date reviewed:** 2017-05-27

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Interesting and instructive paper. It's good enough for publication.