

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

**Manuscript NO:** 70299

**Title:** Comparison of the safety, efficacy, and long-term follow-up between the “One-step” and “Step-up” approaches for treating infected pancreatic necrosis

**Reviewer’s code:** 03805084

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Professor

**Reviewer’s Country/Territory:** Lithuania

**Author’s Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-07-29

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-08-10 09:42

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-08-10 10:03

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**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>

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Overall, a very interesting and well written paper. For me the biggest unanswered question that is not well addresses is the selection criteria for "one step" and "step up" procedures. In a very essence it is advocating the well somehow "old school" established debridement technique and strategy. If the patient selection part is better cristalyzed, then it is of interest to the reader. Step up strategy allows selection of patients who need surgery, while one step approach leads to immediate invasive surgical treatment - that's a disadvantage.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

**Manuscript NO:** 70299

**Title:** Comparison of the safety, efficacy, and long-term follow-up between the “One-step” and “Step-up” approaches for treating infected pancreatic necrosis

**Reviewer’s code:** 05595837

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** CCST, FRCP, MBBS, MRCP

**Professional title:** Consultant Physician-Scientist, Doctor

**Reviewer’s Country/Territory:** United Kingdom

**Author’s Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-07-29

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-08-05 05:33

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-08-17 10:16

**Review time:** 12 Days and 4 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	[ <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
<b>Language quality</b>	[ <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
<b>Conclusion</b>	[ <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
<b>Re-review</b>	[ <input type="radio"/> ] Yes [ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: [ <input type="radio"/> ] Anonymous [ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ <input type="radio"/> ] Yes [ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] No



**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>**

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

I have read with great interest the subject titled: Comparison of the safety, efficacy, and long-term follow-up between the “One-step” and “Step-up” approaches for treating infected pancreatic necrosis. Study design was great, methodology was systematic and findings were excellent. The authors concluded: Compared with the “Step-up” approach, the “One-step” approach is a safe and effective treatment method, with better long-term quality of life and prognosis. It also provides an alternative surgical treatment strategy for patients with infected pancreatic necrosis. In my opinion this will open new horizons in the management of infected pancreatic necrosis and also would draw lots of attention from HPB surgeons and physicians.