

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 68824

**Title:** Is endoscopic retrograde appendicitis therapy a better modality for acute uncomplicated appendicitis? A systematic review and meta-analysis

**Reviewer's code:** 05040484

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Assistant Professor, Doctor, Professor, Research Scientist

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-06-05

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-06-12 07:50

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-06-12 10:09

**Review time:** 2 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" 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

## **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

This systematic review is interesting, but I have a few comments. 1) add the Background section to the abstract 2) all abbreviations must be spelled at the first mention in the abstract 3) indicate in which specific databases were searched in the abstract 4) clarify what you call standard treatment in the abstract 5) add the phrase "systematic review" to the title 6) format quotes as requested by the publisher 7) the control group in these meta-analyses consists of patients who underwent laparoscopic appendectomy and / or antibiotic therapy, but these patients cannot be combined into one group. Authors should compare the effectiveness of the test treatment with only one control group (only appendectomy, only antibacterial therapy, or only a combination of both) or compare it with them separately; studies in children and adults should also be compared separately. 8) The flowchart should be represented as a trunk from which excluded studies exit: 696 excluded duplicates should not be in the trunk of the diagram, but as a branch 9) Check the math in the flowchart: there are errors 10) Authors should provide data from published meta-analyzes on the efficacy, safety and incidence of complications after laparoscopic or antibacterial treatment of acute uncomplicated appendicitis in the Introduction and / or Discussion section

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 68824

**Title:** Is endoscopic retrograde appendicitis therapy a better modality for acute uncomplicated appendicitis? A systematic review and meta-analysis

**Reviewer's code:** 05386374

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-06-05

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-06-12 02:49

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-06-15 10:32

**Review time:** 3 Days and 7 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" 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

## **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

- The prospective studies have not been mentioned in the abstract among the inclusion criteria. - Abbreviations should be defined in the text before using (e.g., ETAR and LA in the abstract). - Keywords should be selected based on relevant MeSH Terms. - Some parts of the introduction discuss the pediatric populations (P3L17, P4L16). Since the pediatric and adult populations are different in prevalence, medical approach, and many other clinical characteristics, it is recommended to replace these paragraphs with relevant background information about the adult population. - The beginning sentence of the “Materials and Methods”, subsection “Search strategy”, should be corrected to “Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses”. - The provided PROSPERO registration code does not belong to this study. CRD42021239961 is registered under the title “Can education improve bowel preparation in patients receiving colonoscopy?A a systematic review and meta-analysis” ([https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/display\\_record.php?RecordID=239961](https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/display_record.php?RecordID=239961)). - Quality assessment should be mentioned in the methods section of the abstract. - The exclusion criteria should be described thoroughly, including all excluded types of articles (e.g., case report, case series, reviews, etc.). - The authors stated that “Q-test and I2-test were used to analyze the heterogeneity of the studies included in this meta-analysis”, but no further details of the heterogeneity assessment has been provided among the result. Moreover, the authors have stated that “the high heterogeneity across included studies was found...” at the beginning of the limitations, without providing results of the heterogeneity assessment. - Figure 1 is not completed properly. All excluded records should be placed on the right side of the flow-diagram, and the main flow should contain the total number of records for each step of the study. Also, the diagram should be continued with a step regarding the “the number of studies included

in the quantitative analysis (meta-analysis)". - Table 1 should include a column describing the type of study. - As implied from the caption of Table 2, all studies have been assessed by the Jadad scale. However, it is mentioned in the Materials and Methods section, under the subsection of "Literature quality evaluation and data extraction", that "For both case-control and cohort studies, Newcastle-Ottawa scale is adopted for assessing the methodological quality...". Since the Jadad scale is usually used to assess controlled trials, are all studies assessed with the Jadad scale? Which studies are evaluated by the Newcastle-Ottawa scale? The authors should address this inconsistency. - The references in Table 2 are wrong. The studies should be appropriately cited. - Table 4 should be replaced with a funnel plot. - Although a Non-Native Speakers of English Editing Certificate has been provided, a considerable number of language and grammatical errors are evident in the manuscript ("apendicitis" in the keywords, "thosuand" on P3L12, etc.).

## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 68824

**Title:** Is endoscopic retrograde appendicitis therapy a better modality for acute uncomplicated appendicitis? A systematic review and meta-analysis

**Reviewer's code:** 05386374

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-06-05

**Reviewer chosen by:** Li-Li Wang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-09-03 17:34

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-09-03 17:54

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input 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>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

## 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](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](http://www.wjgnet.com)

Dear Author, Thank you for the revision and for providing detailed replies to the comments.

## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 68824

**Title:** Is endoscopic retrograde appendicitis therapy a better modality for acute uncomplicated appendicitis? A systematic review and meta-analysis

**Reviewer's code:** 05040484

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Assistant Professor, Doctor, Professor, Research Scientist

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-06-05

**Reviewer chosen by:** Li-Li Wang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-09-03 17:32

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-09-03 19:53

**Review time:** 2 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input 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>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

## 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](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

No comments.