

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

Manuscript NO: 87199

Title: Antimicrobial approach of abdominal post-surgical infections

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 04970307 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: MMed

Professional title: Associate Chief Physician, Surgeon, Surgical Oncologist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2023-07-29

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu (Quit 2023)

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-08-31 07:49

Reviewer performed review: 2023-09-10 01:38

Review time: 9 Days and 17 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[Y] Grade A: Excellent [] 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



Baishideng

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com https://www.wjgnet.com

Scientific significance of the	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair
conclusion in this manuscript	[] 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 [Y] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [] Anonymous [Y] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

SSIs after abdominal surgery are the most common postoperative complications, and cause huge health and financial burden worldwide, especially in low-income countries. Therefore, several international or regional guidelines have introduced aiming to decrease these burdens, such as "Global guidelines for the prevention of surgical site infection" by WHO. However, majority of them concentrated on strategies with prevention ability, while evidence guiding the management of developed SSIs after abdominal surgery have not been summarized comprehensively. Therefore, this review by the authors may add interesting and important information to the literature, although some revisions needed to improve the manuscript. 1. The most important thing of writing a review is organizing the manuscript focusing on the topic, in this review of which is the antibiotic "antimicrobial approach" in "post-abdominal surgical site infections". Therefore, the section "ANTIMICROBIAL MANAGEMENT" should be reviewed more detailedly, from the current antimicrobial strategies and their limitations, to resolutions and future research directions, but not just listed some results of trials. 2. Future perspectives should focus on the perspectives of the authors, but not just list the



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

ongoing clinical trials. 3.Conclusions should focus on summarization of the content of the review and should reach an appropriate conclusion. The variations of bacterial species and gradient across anatomical locations can be moved to section "MICROBIOLOGY". 4.The keywords can be revised more precisely, such as: abdominal post-surgical infections; antimicrobial approach; 5.The writing of the manuscript have been disordered, for example, "MDR Acinetobacter and MDR Pseudomonas are increasing and are related to higher rates of treatment failure camp", need to be revised.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

Manuscript NO: 87199

Title: Antimicrobial approach of abdominal post-surgical infections

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05199192 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Deputy Director

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2023-07-29

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu (Quit 2023)

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-08-31 06:18

Reviewer performed review: 2023-09-10 17:53

Review time: 10 Days and 11 Hours

	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C:
Scientific quality	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	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No scientific significance
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) [] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. The susceptible microbial communities existing in various parts mentioned in the conclusion section should be introduced in the background of the manuscript. 2. In the abstract section, the manuscript proposes "focusing on aetiology and treatment", but the content of the manuscript does not provide a detailed overview of the etiology mechanisms and treatment of postoperative abdominal infections. 3. The content emphasized in the manuscript is unclear, as it does not focus on the antimicrobial methods for infection after abdominal surgery, but rather emphasizes the methods for preventing infection after abdominal surgery. 4. The Classification section of the manuscript mentions that different types of surgeries have varying SSI rates. However, the subsequent text fails to provide a comprehensive description of the antibacterial treatment for each specific type of surgery. 5. The sources and timestamps of the incidence rate data mentioned concerning SSI are mostly concentrated before 2017, and the recent years' incidence rates should also be included. 6. In the section "Antimicrobial treatment" on page 8 of the manuscript, indications for antimicrobial therapy and the treatment of different bacterial infections should be described, rather



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

than summarizing the conclusions of published articles directly. 7. The content of the "Future Perspectives" and "Conclusions" sections on page 10 of the manuscript is redundant and fails to clearly express the central theme of the document. 8. The conclusion of the manuscript should not cite literature. 9. The conclusion section of this article mentions that the concentration of bacteria in different parts of the gastrointestinal tract varies, and it vividly expresses this information through a graph. However, this part appears to be somewhat abrupt, as it has not been introduced in the preceding context.



RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

Manuscript NO: 87199

Title: Antimicrobial approach of abdominal post-surgical infections

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05199192 Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Deputy Director

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2023-07-29

Reviewer chosen by: Jing-Jie Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-10-25 02:20

Reviewer performed review: 2023-10-25 02:42

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] 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



https://www.wjgnet.com

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

No special comments, I agree with the publication.