

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 74214

**Title:** Distinctive clinical features of spontaneous pneumoperitoneum in neonates: A retrospective analysis

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05126851

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Chief Physician, Doctor

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

**Author's Country/Territory:** South Korea

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-12-17

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-01-17 01:14

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-01-28 05:49

**Review time:** 11 Days and 4 Hours

Scientific quality	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<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
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: [ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] Anonymous [ <input type="radio"/> ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ <input type="radio"/> ] Yes [ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] No
-------------------------------------	---

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Dr yong thank you for consulting us as reviewer , our goal is to help you do your best work and to save your precious time .At the same time we think following consideration should be made in your studies , some of important points given below need to be explained and make it correct

- 1 This study had a few limitations. First, this was a retrospective study conducted at a single institution and all diagnoses were based on the results of radiologic findings
- 2 Results are limited by the lack of comparative study for this clinical situation with inclusion of a control group without pneumoperitoneum.
- 3 As they mentioned it was on radiographic bases so it would be better to add more radiological pictures
- 4 Citations are too old, need to add latest literature we would love to highlight latest studies
- 5 English proficiency need to be correct especially in discussion part, many lines written in discussion part need to be explain in professional English
- 6 Discussion part still needs to explain more about distinct clinical features of SP to guide appropriate management by comparing characteristics between SP and typical pneumoperitoneum secondary to gastrointestinal perforation.
- 7 This study did not find a significant correlation between these variables with high mortality. Instead, only preterm infants were significantly associated with high mortality.

looking forward for your manuscript again best regards

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 74214

**Title:** Distinctive clinical features of spontaneous pneumoperitoneum in neonates: A retrospective analysis

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 03069247

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, MSc

**Professional title:** Associate Professor, Surgeon

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** United Arab Emirates

**Author's Country/Territory:** South Korea

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-12-17

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-01-29 07:21

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-02-04 00:56

**Review time:** 5 Days and 17 Hours

Scientific quality	<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
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<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
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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>

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: [ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] Anonymous [ <input type="radio"/> ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ <input type="radio"/> ] Yes [ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] No
-------------------------------------	---

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

I would like to thank the author for their efforts. The authors are discussing an important topic of spontaneous pneumoperitoneum (SP) without gastrointestinal perforation. It is not clear for me, that the mortality of operative intervention (which is nontherapeutic) having less mortality rate compared with the conservative management which is the ideal management for such cases. I think that there are other factors related to the higher mortality rate in the conservative group that need to be discussed.

## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 74214

**Title:** Distinctive clinical features of spontaneous pneumoperitoneum in neonates: A retrospective analysis

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 03069247

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, MSc

**Professional title:** Associate Professor, Surgeon

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** United Arab Emirates

**Author's Country/Territory:** South Korea

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-12-17

**Reviewer chosen by:** Yun-Xiaojuan Wu

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-03-04 06:20

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-03-04 08:40

**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 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>Peer-reviewer</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous



**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>

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

## **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Answers of the authors are accepted