PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Meta-Analysis*

Manuscript NO: 80359

Title: Current approach for Boerhaaves syndrome: A systematic review of case reports

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05742869

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Research Scientist, Surgeon, Surgical Oncologist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Kazakhstan

Author's Country/Territory: Japan

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-16

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-01-06 06:38

Reviewer performed review: 2023-01-06 11:28

Review time: 4 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [Y] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No scientific significance
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	[ ] Yes [Y] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Manuscript title: "Current approach for Boerhaave syndrome: A systematic review of case reports" Many thanks for giving me an opportunity to make a revision to this systematic review. As everyone understands, the preparation of a systematic review is so rigorous hard work that requires scientific knowledge and time to collect and analyze articles. I really appreciate the authors for their work, and below indicated some of my suggestions to improve the quality of the manuscript to make this work appropriate for publication.   -I suggest to authors indicate in the abstract the main aim of the performing this systematic review.   -Not all keywords follow MeSH requirements, authors should check it (link: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/).   - Despite the fact that Boerhaave syndrome is rare disease, in the introduction section   authors gave an explanation to necessity of studying the therapeutic methods and clinical outcomes and discuss the current trends in the management of Boerhaave syndrome. -As it known that during the conducting of systematic review authors should follow PRISMA item(link   to   checklist: http://prisma-statement.org/documents/PRISMA_2020_checklist.pdf).   According to

this checklist, I recommend to authors provide a table with keywords and Boolean operators, to show the search strategy for each database. -The authors haven't provided any justification for using only three databases (Pubmed, Cochrane Library, and Medline).It requires any explanation or authors should include articles from other databases. -And there is necessity to give explanation why only period from 2017 to 2022 was chosen to search articles. -Absence of assessing the risk of bias (lack of the quality assessment) to establish the evidence of results and analysis. - The authors indicated that the study design, patient's demographic data, intervention related data, and outcomes were extracted from the included 49 studies. However, there is a necessity to add the table with included to analysis articles with variables which were analyzed. Authors should provide results of the assessment of the risk of bias. -The quality of tables not so good, tables were presented as images. Aa I mentioned above these tables give common information. In this situation it will be appropriate to add tables with descriptive comparative characteristics of all included 49 studies and demonstrate some variables. In the figure 1(study selection flow chart) I suggest to authors to use standard flow diagram (https://prismastatement.org/prismastatement/flowdiagram.aspx?AspxAutoDetectCo okieSupport=1). Because, in this manuscript figure 1 a bit isn't informative, by the reason is information regarding duplicates, and etc. were missed. -The authors indicated that they used "PRISMA 2009 Checklist - Evidence-Based Medicine, Systematic review, Meta-Analysis", however they should add to manuscript mentioned above some points and explanations of this checklist. To my mind, that this manuscript isn't suitable for publication in a journal of such level.

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No scientific significance
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) [Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[ ] Yes [Y] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [ ] Anonymous [Y] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Congratulations to the authors who performed a correct systematic review thus summarising what is the treatment of a very rare acute pathology.