PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 82487

Title: Classification of Hepatobiliary Scintigraphy Pattern in Segmented Gallbladder according to the Anatomical Discordance

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02719046

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Tunisia

Author's Country/Territory: South Korea

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-21

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-12-22 21:51

Reviewer performed review: 2022-12-22 21:59

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[ ] Yes [Y] No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this manuscript the authors report an interesting study about the Classification of Hepatobiliary Scintigraphy Pattern in Segmented Gallbladder according to the Anatomical Discordance. The authors have made a respectable effort.   The title reflects the main subject of the manuscript.   The abstract summarizes and reflects the work described in the manuscript. The abstract is compatible with the main text. The figures and the tables are adequate The references are up-to-date. The study design is appropriate to answer the research question   The methods are sufficiently described to allow the study The use of statistics is appropriate Overall, the presentation of the is work clear and   this manuscript represents a useful contribution to the medical literature and deserves to be published. The style, language and grammar require major revision

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[Y] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[Y] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[ ] Yes [Y] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

A clinicallly sound manuscript with new learning

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 82487

Title: Classification of Hepatobiliary Scintigraphy Pattern in Segmented Gallbladder according to the Anatomical Discordance

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03034605

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MBBS, MCh, MD

Professional title: Assistant Professor, Attending Doctor, Chief Doctor, Consultant Physician-Scientist, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: South Korea

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-21

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-12-28 07:40

Reviewer performed review: 2023-01-06 08:46

Review time: 9 Days and 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good
	[Y] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair
	[ ] Grade D: No novelty

Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation
Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [Y] Rejection
Re-review	[ ] Yes [Y] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors have presented an interesting study on impact of segmented gallbladder on hepatobiliary scintigraphy (HBS) findings. However, the clinical application of this study is limited as HBS is rarely done in clinical practice. Moreover, as mentioned in the study, more than 50% patients had associated gallstones or chronic cholecystitis which itself is an indication for cholecystectomy.   It is important to understand that gallstones themselves can impact HBS findings. So, if we have to study the impact of segmented GB on HBS then we should only include patients of segmented GB without gallstones. The authors can perform a subgroup analysis of such patients. But looking at the presented data, I believe the number would be small.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 82487

Title: Classification of Hepatobiliary Scintigraphy Pattern in Segmented Gallbladder according to the Anatomical Discordance

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02445477

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: FACS, MS

Professional title: Chief Doctor, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: South Korea

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-21

Reviewer chosen by: Li Li

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-02-16 17:20

Reviewer performed review: 2023-02-17 16:12

Review time: 22 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Revised manuscript merits publication.

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [Y] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this manuscript, the authors report an interesting study about the Classification of Hepatobiliary Scintigraphy Pattern in Segmented Gallbladder according to the Anatomical Discordance The authors have made a respectable effort. The title reflects the main subject of the manuscript. The abstract summarizes and reflects the work described in the manuscript. The keywords reflect the focus of the manuscript. The references are up-to-date. The style, language and grammar require minor revision The tables are appropriate and authentic This manuscript has important creativity and innovation. It meets the code of ethics standards. The authors used reliable research methods. The accompanying data and methods are authentic. The use of statistics is appropriate Overall, this manuscript represents a useful contribution to the medical literature

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors have made appropriate changes in the manuscript.