

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Pediatrics

ESPS manuscript NO: 14981

Title: Appendicitis in the first years of life: a challenge for the general practitioner

Reviewer's code: 02454257

Reviewer's country: Germany

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2014-11-04 20:25

Date reviewed: 2014-11-12 15:37

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

With this manuscript the authors present a review on a rare but clinically relevant issue: early childhood appendicitis and its reliable diagnostic. Title: "... in the first years of life..." should be defined by the authors. Within the text the limit is at 5 years, at another stage at 3 years as well as under one year. This requires clarification. Abstract: The last paragraph of the abstract shows - as well as the title of the manuscript - that a timely diagnosis of early childhood appendicitis is a "challenge". Unfortunately the authors do not provide sufficient data on how their manuscript is supposed to support the general practitioner to meet this challenge. Introduction: The first sentence is misleading: the authors state that appendicitis is the most common reason for abdominal pain and then: "...with a peak in the 2nd decade...". This age group is not the focus of the manuscript. Epidemiology: Analysis of cited literature is one of the objectives of a review article. The authors cite the article of Bansal et al from 2012. In this context it should be mentioned that the number of perforated appendices has been assessed from a group of 7(!). It is not possible to draw valid statistical conclusions from this small number of cases; which is not done by Bansal et al, and therefore it remains completely open if the differences in the perforation rate of the different age

groups do have statistical relevance. Anatomy and pathophysiology: Approaching the risk factors for childhood appendicitis, the (protective?) effect of breast feeding should at least be discussed. The following sections on history and clinical examination, laboratory and radiological evaluation list older and recent literature. Especially if a decision guidance for a general practitioner is meant to be provided it would be very supportive to present the data in a clinical pathway, flow chart or something similar. The most vigorous deficit of this manuscript is the lack of recommendations for daily routine. These recommendations should be clearly defined; this would require i. e. information on the interval of re-evaluation of children in an unclear situation. The recommendation of repeated ultrasound evaluation should be clearly spelled out. Especially for this there are recent very good articles available showing that repeated ultrasound evaluation in a defined interval increases sensitivity. CT as diagnostic tools should be assessed in a more critical fashion. It should be clearly spelled out that the CT evaluation of a child less than one year old requires a well justified decision since the radiation dose is high and sequelae may be significant. Some sentences are recommended regarding the gender situation. Are there remarkable differences between girls and boys in clinical presentation and time of diagnosis? Table 1 lacks validity in the presented form. It would be more sensible to present this data in a differential diagnostic context as done in table 2 with the differential diagnostics in gastroenteritis. Figure 1 has a very limited diagnostic value and should better be presented as text. In Figure 2 the legend of the x-axis is missing. Obviously it is supposed to be the headline of the figure. It is no good style to start a legend with "%". In the current presentation the scientific value of this manuscript is low. Especially if the target reader is the general practitioner recommendations should be clearly defined.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Pediatrics

ESPS manuscript NO: 14981

Title: Appendicitis in the first years of life: a challenge for the general practitioner

Reviewer's code: 02731621

Reviewer's country: Turkey

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2014-11-04 20:25

Date reviewed: 2014-11-04 22:12

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This manuscript, entitled "Appendicitis in the first years of life: a challenge for the general practitioner." is a well designed review. It should be accepted for publishing.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Pediatrics

ESPS manuscript NO: 14981

Title: Appendicitis in the first years of life: a challenge for the general practitioner

Reviewer's code: 02512137

Reviewer's country: Serbia

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2014-11-04 20:25

Date reviewed: 2014-11-06 19:29

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I red and review the manuscript entitled " Appendicitis in the first years of life: a challenge for the general practitioner " I agree with authors that the appendicitis in the first years o f life continues to be a open problem in general surgery. This paper is very attractive and useful and my opinion is to accept them without changes.