

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 39082

Title: Current practices and future prospects for the management of gallbladder polyps:
a topical review

Reviewer's code: 03213658

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Xue-Jiao Wang

Date sent for review: 2018-04-13

Date reviewed: 2018-04-14

Review time: 1 Day

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This article introduces the polyps of gallbladder, which are divided into true and false, and the latter will not become cancerous. It also introduces how to distinguish these two kinds of polyps from various imaging examinations, and polyp size and surveillance



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https:// www.wjgnet.com

influence the management of gallbladder polyps. The author introduces the risk factors of malignant polyps. At last, the author makes a summary that the concept that more than 10mm size of polyps of gallbladder are genuine polyps is not very true and it needs more research to prove. The writing is reasonable and the data is detailed and has high clinical practical value. It is recommended to delete some old documents and supplement the literature in recent 5 years.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 39082

Title: Current practices and future prospects for the management of gallbladder polyps:
a topical review

Reviewer's code: 00505440

Reviewer's country: Australia

Science editor: Xue-Jiao Wang

Date sent for review: 2018-04-13

Date reviewed: 2018-04-17

Review time: 3 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is very thorough and well researched review on gallbladder polyps. While the data presented was not new, I do not believe a review article is meant to provide new data but instead provide a balanced overview of the existing literature which is exactly what

the authors have achieved!

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 39082

Title: Current practices and future prospects for the management of gallbladder polyps:
a topical review

Reviewer's code: 00070545

Reviewer's country: South Korea

Science editor: Xue-Jiao Wang

Date sent for review: 2018-04-13

Date reviewed: 2018-04-18

Review time: 4 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This article well descriebd about management of gallbladder polys.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https:// www.wjgnet.com

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 39082

Title: Current practices and future prospects for the management of gallbladder polyps: a topical review

Reviewer's code: 03471208

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Xue-Jiao Wang

Date sent for review: 2018-04-10

Date reviewed: 2018-04-29

Review time: 18 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This review provides recent update regarding Current practices and future prospects for the management of gallbladder polyps. The review article can be accepted after major corrections. Comments: 1. Extensive language polishing is required. In



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https:// www.wjgnet.com

addition spelling, grammar, typing errors should be checked and corrected extensively.
2. Some places references are missing, kindly update with recent updated references. 3.
The authors are advised to add one more section added as: Genetic risk factors
associated with the disease.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 39082

Title: Current practices and future prospects for the management of gallbladder polyps:
a topical review

Reviewer's code: 03647271

Reviewer's country: South Korea

Science editor: Xue-Jiao Wang

Date sent for review: 2018-04-13

Date reviewed: 2018-05-02

Review time: 19 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this review, author summarized the practice guideline and future perspectives for management of gallbladder polyps. Although they provided informative review, there were several concerns for publication. Therefore I'd like to give several comments that



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https:// www.wjgnet.com

need addressing. Major revision 1. Since most abdominal ultrasound examination was performed using HRUS in recent years, HRUS should not be described separately. Therefore, HRUS, 3D US, and contrast US should be included in TAUS section. 2. EUS has several characteristic differences from TAUS, and it has been reported that the diagnostic accuracy for GBP is improved by adding contrast or doppler flow measurement in addition to conventional examinations. Therefore, it is necessary to describe the role of EUS in more detail compared to the advantages and disadvantages of the TAUS. I recommend quoting the following articles. - Eur Radiol. 2018 May;28(5):1994-2002. The efficacy of real-time colour Doppler flow imaging on endoscopic ultrasonography for differential diagnosis between neoplastic and non-neoplastic gallbladder polyps. - Gastrointest Endosc. 2013 Sep;78(3):484-93. Utility of contrast-enhanced harmonic EUS in the diagnosis of malignant gallbladder polyps (with videos). - Surg Endosc. 2013 Apr;27(4):1414-21. Differential diagnosis between gallbladder adenomas and cholesterol polyps on contrast-enhanced harmonic endoscopic ultrasonography. 3. AJCC TNM stage for GB cancer was revised in 2017, and N stage was determined by involvement of number of LN. Therefore, you should revise the introduction section of AJCC stage. 4. In the section of surveillance, you should the exact follow up schedule of ESGAR guideline. In this guideline, risk factor is important determinant for further treatment. In case of both 6-9mm size without risk factor and size <5mm with risk factor, FU US is recommended at 6 months, 1 year and then yearly up to 5 years. In terms of no risk factor < 5mm polyp, 1 year, 3 years, and 5 years US are advised. 5. In addition, ESGAR guideline suggested the prophylactic cholecystectomy for 6-9mm sessile polyp. You should clarify this indication in your paragraph of sessile morphology 6. Becuase congenital anomaly of biliary system such as APBDU and choledochal cyst has a high risk for gallbladder cancer, I think you'd better describe this risk factor in your paper. Thank you.



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https:// www.wjgnet.com

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No