Baishideng Publishing Group

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 50875

Title: Colorectal surgeon consensus with hemorrhoid clinical practice guidelines

Reviewer's code: 03001816

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's country: Reviewer_Country

Author's country: Australia

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ping Yan

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-08-20 11:35

Reviewer performed review: 2019-08-20 15:02

Review time: 3 Hours

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[ ] Grade E: Do not publish		[ ] Rejection	[ ] Advanced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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This study evaluates to what degree colorectal surgeons in Australia and New Zealand

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

agree with and apply clinical practice guidelines for hemorrhoid treatment. Seventeen clinical scenarios were provided, with choices, including the current guidelines, and responses were recorded and analyzed. 47% of the scenarios showed considerable disagreement among physicians, and one other scenario, a majority disagreed with the guidelines. The areas of disagreement (among physicians - leading to "equipoise" - less than 70% consensus, and also in one case 87% disagreed with the guidelines) were associated with low to moderate evidence. The authors suggest these to be areas of future research. This is a useful study to delineate those areas in the field that require stronger evidence for guidelines. The paper is acceptable for publication. One optional suggestion would be for the authors to expand a bit more on the correlation between disagreement and quality of evidence. It would seem that the former derives from the latter; that there is insufficient evidence backing some of these guidelines so as to convince more than 70% of the physicians to agree with current guidelines. A conclusion could be to specifically prioritize evidence quality for those guidelines. Perhaps as well, as a follow-up, interrogate the physicians as to the reasons for their disagreement.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

[ ] The same title

[ ] Duplicate publication

[ ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

BPG Search:

[ ] The same title

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

[ ] Duplicate publication

[ ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

Baishideng Publishing Group

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 50875

Title: Colorectal surgeon consensus with hemorrhoid clinical practice guidelines

Reviewer's code: 03538879
Position: Editorial Board
Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Chief Doctor, Professor

Reviewer's country: China

Author's country: Australia

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ping Yan

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-09-06 23:10

Reviewer performed review: 2019-09-10 02:38

Review time: 3 Days and 3 Hours

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a nice study investigating clinical practitioners' responses to current medical

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

guidelines. I only have two questions. Firstly, I suggest authors revise the title, indicating the study was a survey. Current title may be misunderstood as an expert consensus statement of hemorrhoid management. Secondly, the number of respondents were the main concern. Only 82 gave responses. Indeed, this number is not identical, like authors mentioned in the limitation. In addition, authors only investigate surgeons from the single society. I believe some surgeons may be the initiators of the clinical practice guideline. This may lead to extra bias of the investigation. And what about the opinion outside the society? The general applicability of the conclusion may also be uncertain.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

[ ] The same title

[ ] Duplicate publication

[ ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

BPG Search:

[ ] The same title

[ ] Duplicate publication

[ ] Plagiarism

[Y] No