

Detailed response to the reviewers' comments -Manuscript 53909

Reviewer #1: This review about management of complicated acute appendicitis in children is generally comprehensive, although the controversy exists.

Comments 1. In the introduction section, the authors stated the life-time risk of appendectomy is 23.1% in girls and 12% in boys and a life-time risk of developing acute appendicitis is 7% in girls and 9% in boys. These data had several meanings. It suggests that many children had incidental appendectomy for other surgical disease other than for acute appendicitis. The former is not the focus in this review and may confuse readers. The data also have confusion of concept of "life-time" in children. Do you mean in his or her life-time till 18 years of age, or throughout the life till death?

Response 1.

Agreed. Careful changes were made to the lifetime risk of appendectomies and developing acute appendicitis according to your suggestion. The relevant references are also displayed. The lifetime risk is referred to the probability of developing acute appendicitis or having an appendectomy throughout the life.

Reviewer #2: I have read the manuscript entitled "Operative versus non-operative management of complicated acute appendicitis in children: Still an existing controversy". This is a review article which give us the current data of operative versus non operative management of complicated acute appendicitis (CAA) in children in details. In generally, this paper would contribute to the literature and be beneficial for pediatric surgeons.

However, there are many typographical errors and English should be polished, so some sentences are not well understood.

Response 2.1:

The manuscript 53909 was edited for proper English language, grammar, punctuation, spelling, and overall style, according to your suggestions. A certificate of proper corrections is provided.

Order of the citations throughout the text should be re-arranged. Because some references are not correspond with cited authors. In addition, some listed references are not used for citation in the text.

Response 2.2

Citation order was re-arranged throughout the text. References were also re-numbered.

Although they have stated that 46 article retrieved from literature, they gave 47 article in the following.

Response 2.3

The actual number of articles referred from literature is 47 and it is stated in the text

Abbreviations could be better used. The title of the study in Reference 27 should be provided. Written of the references could be uniform.

Response 2.4

Abbreviations were revised and dereferences' style were revised. Reference 27 was also corrected

Also, Table 1 is unnecessary, which seems a duplicate of the reference list.

Response 2.5

Table 1 was omitted according to your suggestion