

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

Manuscript NO: 88631

Title: Added value of ratio of cross diameters of the appendix in ultrasound diagnosis of acute appendicitis

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06414857

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Spain

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-10-02

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-10-02 14:34

Reviewer performed review: 2023-10-03 09:57

Review time: 19 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 Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
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
Peer-reviewer statements	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

Recently a study was published evaluating appendiceal caliber and its diagnostic yield in pediatric appendicitis in the context of a multivariable index. It is interesting to consider as a tool a multivariable score that includes items from different areas (clinical, analytical and radiological). I recommend reviewing it and including the reference Arredondo Montero J, Bardají Pascual C, Antona G, Ros Briones R, López-Andrés N, Martín-Calvo N. The BIDIAP index: a clinical, analytical and ultrasonographic score for the diagnosis of acute appendicitis in children. *Pediatr Surg Int*. 2023 Apr 10;39(1):175. doi: 10.1007/s00383-023-05463-5. PMID: 37038002; PMCID: PMC10085908. Clarify in the abstract that the study is retrospective. The introduction begins abruptly. It is not correct to start a paper by saying "It has been recommended". The methodology selected for patient inclusion could constitute a selection bias. Ideally, the authors should have compared the sample analyzed with the total potentially eligible population at the beginning of the study. Clarify as a limitation. There is great variability in the professionals who performed the ultrasound study. Consider as a limitation. Were they radiologists or was it POCUS? Histopathologic classification: Specify (describe) that it



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: office@baishideng.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

was considered phlegmonous, gangrenous and perforated appendicitis. Specify (describe) what was considered a negative appendectomy. Specify which test was used to assess the normality of the distribution of quantitative variables. Although the authors clarify that an expert English reviewer was used, there are expressions in the text that sound unnatural or forced. Review (e.g., The receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve was drawn; veteran sonographer). this study magnifies the diagnostic yield since it does not include patients without appendicular identification, this should be added as a limitation. Explain Youden's formula (J). Clarify whether p