

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 53196

Title: Clinical and microbiological characteristics of biliary disease patients

Reviewer's code: 03520161

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor, Lecturer, Senior Researcher

Reviewer's country: Israel

Author's country: China

Manuscript submission date: 2019-12-19

Reviewer chosen by: Jie Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-01-10 21:17

Reviewer performed review: 2020-01-28 21:34

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" 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 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

Overall nice study and not-noevl data on a large sample of patients assesing microbiological characteristics of biliary disease patients. I have several major issues 1- How the authors explain the high positive culture rate among benign disease compared to patients with malignant disease ? 2- In the "Distribution of the bacteria identified in 738 bile samples with positive bile culture based on the different diseases caused by them" section, the authors stated that "in contrast" - i disagree with that, in fact both for benign and malignant disease - almost the same micro-organisms were positively cultured - please modify the paragraph !! and change the 3- in the discussion: the statment "and found a slight difference. E. coli, Enterococcus, P. aeruginosa, and K. pneumoniae were the most common bacteria present in patients with benign diseases. Conversely, E. coli, Enterococcus, K. pneumoniae, and Staphylococcus were the predominant bacteria in patients with malignant diseases. This maybe meaningful for doctors to choose accurate therapy account for microbiological profiles in different diseases. " is not accurate - the prevalence is almost the same - please modify the conclusion 4- It seems that the most important point in this study is the susceptibility profiles of the micro-organisms as most of them were resistant to cephalosporins, quinolones and ampicillin - this findings is important and should be further disussed - please elborate more 5- sub-analysis should be performed to assess what are the risk factors for this high resistance rate, since not all patients with biliary infections are going to be treated with carbapenems, piperailin and gentamicin due to cost issues and emerging resistance, it is crucial to identify predictors for patients with high resistance for the traditional used antibiotics (cephalosporins and others) so those patients will be administered the more potent antibiotics. 6- the authors reported in that "Minimum inhibitory concentrations (MICs) for antibiotic were determined using the broth dilution method, E test (bioMérieux), or disk diffusion methods according to Clinical Laboratory Standards Institute guidelines" - where the authors reported the MICs in the results or



**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

tables ? 7- the manuscript need english language editing

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: 53196

Title: Clinical and microbiological characteristics of biliary disease patients

Reviewer's code: 00503575

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MSc, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Doctor

Reviewer's country: Morocco

Author's country: China

Manuscript submission date: 2019-12-19

Reviewer chosen by: Ruo-Yu Ma

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-02-10 05:43

Reviewer performed review: 2020-02-17 02:49

Review time: 6 Days and 21 Hours

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 type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input checked="" 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

1. The authors stated in the conclusion of the abstract that intestinal bacteria were the main source of biliary bacteria. However, the authors mentioned in the introduction that the bacteria may also invade through the blood and lymphatic system. What make the authors sure to address such confirmation in the abstract? 2. In Materials and methods section, it is usually convenient to start with the "patient's characteristics" subsection (Clinical characteristics). 3. In many occasions the names of bacterial species should be mentioned in italic 4. In result section, the title "Distribution of the bacteria identified in 738 bile samples with positive bile culture based on the different diseases caused by them" should better read: "Distribution of bile bacteria and diseases cause" 5. In the discussion section, the authors stated "Therefore, at the species level, the pathogenic bacteria in the biliary tract were basically identical to intestinal bacteria in the biliary tract..." This sentence is confusing. The biliary tract seems duplicated. Do the authors perform bacterial profile in the intestine? 6. In the discussion section, the sentence "Microbiological profiles may be different account for different diseases." Should be reformulated to read for example: Microbiological profiles may be related to different diseases. 7. In the discussion section, the sentence "...but the evidence was little definite and less of fundamental reseaches. This sentence is meaningless.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

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

BPG Search:



**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

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

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 53196

Title: Clinical and microbiological characteristics of biliary disease patients

Reviewer's code: 00503575

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MSc, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Doctor

Reviewer's country: Morocco

Author's country: China

Manuscript submission date: 2019-12-19

Reviewer chosen by: Ying Dou

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-03-11 05:04

Reviewer performed review: 2020-03-12 06:09

Review time: 1 Day and 1 Hour

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 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 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



**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

The manuscript still need language editing. Many sentences are still meaningless and need to be reformulated. For example in the discussion: So maybe ceftriaxone and ampicillin were not recommended. This sentence seems out of context. Therefore, at the species level, which is consistent with the results. This sentence is grammatically incorrect.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

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

BPG Search:

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

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 53196

Title: Clinical and microbiological characteristics of biliary disease patients

Reviewer's code: 03520161

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor, Lecturer, Senior Researcher

Reviewer's country: Israel

Author's country: China

Manuscript submission date: 2019-12-19

Reviewer chosen by: Ying Dou

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-03-12 15:37

Reviewer performed review: 2020-03-12 15:53

Review time: 1 Hour

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input checked="" 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 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



**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

Overall the authors did a good job

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

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

BPG Search:

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