

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 75317

**Title:** Critical values of monitoring indexes for perioperative MACE in elderly patients with biliary diseases

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited manuscript; externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 00068723

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Doctor, Occupational Physician

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-01-23

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-01-24 23:24

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-01-26 04:36

**Review time:** 1 Day and 5 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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 authors searched for prognostic markers for major cardiac adverse events (MACE) around surgery for patients with biliary diseases. They found out that BNP and d-dimer were related with MACE. The aim was clear, and the results were interesting. But presentation and design were immature. Definition of the diseases were not clear. This might affect the result. All the data depended on MACE or not. Definition of MACE was not clear. Was acute myocardial infarction STEMI only? Or did it include NSTEMI-ACS? How were heart failure or pulmonary edema diagnosed? Ventricular fibrillation was one form of cardiac arrest. But ventricular fibrillation and cardiac arrest were equally described. How would the authors think about this point? What was complete heart block? Was it complete atrio-ventricular block? Was complete atrio-ventricular block MACE? How would the authors think about arrhythmias? Were the causes of cardiac arrest clear? For example, ventricular fibrillation, pulseless ventricular tachycardia, pulseless electric activity, asystole. In cases of pulseless electric activity and asystole, their causes might exist. The causes should be presented. What was biliary diseases? Table 1. Describe each MACE. For example, AMI 1 patient, etc. They were describe in the text. But they should be present in a table. Diagnosis of biliary diseases was not clear. What was cholelithiasis? Cholecystolithiasis or choledocolithiasis? What was biliary inflammation? Acute cholecystitis or acute cholangitis? Were they due to biliary stones or cancer? What was biliary tumor? Intrahepatic bile duct cancer? Extrahepatic bile duct cancer? Gallbladder cancer? Table 2 and Table 3 looked the same. What were the differences? Table 2 and Table 3 showed MYO showed significance. But the significance was lost in Table 4. How would the authors address this point? BNP and

d-dimers were interesting. BNP and d-dimers were related with heart failure and pulmonary embolism. Two cases of congestive heart failure were included in MACE group. But pulmonary embolism was not found in MACE group. How would the authors speculate the cause of the significance of d-dimer?

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 75317

**Title:** Critical values of monitoring indexes for perioperative MACE in elderly patients with biliary diseases

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited manuscript; externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05759722

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Research Scientist, Teaching Assistant

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-01-23

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-01-30 10:44

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-02-09 08:12

**Review time:** 9 Days and 21 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input 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

In this manuscript, the authors have conducted an investigation for the critical values of monitoring indexes for perioperative major adverse cardiac events (MACE) in elderly patients with biliary diseases. The SPSS software was used for statistical analysis and the Logistic regression was used to analyse the independent risk factors of perioperative MACE. The manuscript is well-written, and the results provided are satisfactory. This study can be accepted after addressing the following concerns: 1. The abstract is lengthy. However, it needs to be shortened. 2. In the introduction, the contribution of the proposed work and the the research objectives to be achieved are not clear. 3. The authors have only provide a comparative analysis of clinical data between MACE and non-MACE group in elderly patients with biliary diseases; and comparison of monitoring indexes. However, a comparative analysis section between the proposed study and the related literature contributions is needed.

## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 75317

**Title:** Critical values of monitoring indexes for perioperative MACE in elderly patients with biliary diseases

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited manuscript; externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 00068723

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Doctor, Occupational Physician

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-01-23

**Reviewer chosen by:** Ji-Hong Liu

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-04-13 07:20

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-04-29 01:28

**Review time:** 15 Days and 18 Hours

Scientific quality	<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
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Peer-reviewer	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  
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

statements

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

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

The manuscript has been improved." The manuscript was acceptable.