

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**Manuscript NO:** 55190

**Title:** Epidemiology of perforating peptic ulcer: A population-based retrospective study over 40 years

**Reviewer's code:** 03766962

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** China

**Author's Country/Territory:** Norway

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-03-24

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-03-25 12:46

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-03-26 02:37

**Review time:** 13 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**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>

## **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

1 Title. The title can reflect the main subject of the manuscript 2 Abstract. The abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript 3 Key words. The key words can reflect the focus of the manuscript 4 Background. The manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study 5 Methods. The manuscript describe methods in adequate detail 6 Results. The research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study, the result can guide clinical practice of peptic ulcer treatment 7 Discussion. The manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically. 8 Illustrations and tables. The figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents. 9 Biostatistics. The manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics 10 Units. The manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units 11 References. The manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections