

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 75488

**Title:** Gallstone associated celiac trunk thromboembolisms complicated with splenic infarction : A case report

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05142912

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MBBS

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Saudi Arabia

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-02-06

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-02-06 18:48

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-02-06 19:08

**Review time:** 1 Hour

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 Grade E: Do not publish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 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

Thank you for submitting this rare case report. It is quadrant not quarter. What do you mean by bidirectional relationship between inflammation and perturbation of the coagulation process. Please elaborate. How rare is celiac trunk thromboembolism complicated by splenic infarction in percentage? What are the missed diagnosis or misdiagnosis in variable clinical clues and complex etiology? What kind of vascular and thrombotic diseases that is detected by CECT? What are possible underlying etiology when dealing with splenic infarction? What are the incidence of gallstone disease in Western countries? What do you mean when came to outpatient clinic but he was referred to emergency department. So the patient visited which one first? What is the benefit of saying no habits of chewing betel nuts? Please write the full name of abbreviation (NOAC). The patient treatment in hospital was only heparin for 3 days.?? then switched to apixaban? Were hematology on board? Who decided the anticoagulation type and doses? The patient six weeks after discharge, he was readmitted. The patient was not seen in regular clinic after discharge? Elaborate and explain more in discussion part about the bidirectional relationship with inflammation and thrombus. Thank you

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 75488

**Title:** Gallstone associated celiac trunk thromboembolisms complicated with splenic infarction : A case report

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 03822338

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** FACS, MBBS, MNAMS, MS

**Professional title:** Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-02-06

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-02-08 18:02

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-02-08 19:35

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

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

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Authors, I congratulate you for working up and adequately following up a very interesting case. In order to improve the article, I have made a few suggestions which is as attached in the manuscript with comments.

1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? YES

2 Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? YES (minor modification suggested)

3 Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? YES

4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? YES

5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? NOT APPLICABLE

6 Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study? What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field? NOT APPLICABLE

7 Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically? Are the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner? Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper's scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently? YES

8 Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents? Do figures require labeling with arrows, asterisks etc., better legends? NO (NEED MODIFICATIONS)

9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? NOT APPLICABLE

10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? YES

11 References. Does the manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the



**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>

introduction and discussion sections? Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references?YES 12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate?YES 13 Research methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to manuscript type and the appropriate categories, as follows: (1) CARE Checklist (2013) - Case report; (2) CONSORT 2010 Statement - Clinical Trials study, Prospective study, Randomized Controlled trial, Randomized Clinical trial; (3) PRISMA 2009 Checklist - Evidence-Based Medicine, Systematic review, Meta-Analysis; (4) STROBE Statement - Case Control study, Observational study, Retrospective Cohort study; and (5) The ARRIVE Guidelines - Basic study. Did the author prepare the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting?YES 14 Ethics statements. For all manuscripts involving human studies and/or animal experiments, author(s) must submit the related formal ethics documents that were reviewed and approved by their local ethical review committee. Did the manuscript meet the requirements of ethics? NOT APPLICABLE