

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

ESPS manuscript NO: 26472

Title: Hydatid cyst of the gallbladder: A systematic review of the literature

Reviewer's code: 03549048

Reviewer's country: Romania

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2016-04-13 15:53

Date reviewed: 2016-04-14 05:00

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" 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 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

In this study the authors search the literature for information regarding a very rare pathology, gallbladder cystic hydatidosis. The paper has the merit of being the first to review this pathology. Some revision of your paper is necessary: 1. Additional search terms should have been used such as "hydatidosis" and "echinococcosis". Papers such as "Secondary gallbladder hydatidosis and nonfragmented germinative membrane sourced obstructive jaundice caused by intrabiliary ruptured hepatic hydatid cyst (a case report): two rare complication of the intrabiliary ruptured hepatic hydatid cyst. Yücesoy AN, Po?an S." might have been omitted 2. On page 3 the authors state:"two results for both searches (GHD and GHC) in the Cochrane Library: neither met the inclusion criteria." Please mention the inclusion criteria before describing the selection process 2..As the clinical picture of the disease is unspecific, the preoperative diagnosis is likely to rely on the imaging findings. Simply enumerating the imaging techniques used does not bring any additional information. The results section should be expanded and include typical and atypical imaging findings. The discussion should include an imaging differential diagnosis and offer details regarding the aspect of intramural vs. intravesicular GBHC if available. I would also highly recommend including suggestive



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

images from the cited papers, including MRI if possible (with the authors' permission). These changes would broaden the interest for your paper (radiologists, ultrasound specialists). 3. At least three papers included in your review report Cholecysto-hydatid cyst fistulas. These should be discussed separately (including imaging findings) as they represent a complication of liver hydatidosis. 4. 2/16 patients died as a consequence of the disease or the management. These cases should also be discussed including causing factors. 5. The conclusion should be shorter, including only the most relevant facts. Parts of it belong to the introduction and discussion. General comments: 1. It would be useful, if possible, to categorize the different types of GBHC (for example intramural, intravesicular, fistula) and to discuss the imaging and pathological findings accordingly 2. The discussion section should be expanded by explaining some of the observation (e.g. why some patients present jaundice, whereas others do not)

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

ESPS manuscript NO: 26472

Title: Hydatid cyst of the gallbladder: A systematic review of the literature

Reviewer's code: 00074960

Reviewer's country: Mexico

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2016-04-13 15:53

Date reviewed: 2016-04-15 07:49

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input 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

In my opinion I think that the authors should develop a little more the hypothesis of infestation of the gallbladder , do not mention the hematic way as a possibility. Another aspect that could bring are the complications of gallbladder cysts mainly the rupture of cysts and the consequent migration of the components of the cyst.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

ESPS manuscript NO: 26472

Title: Hydatid cyst of the gallbladder: A systematic review of the literature

Reviewer's code: 02438890

Reviewer's country: Turkey

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2016-04-13 15:53

Date reviewed: 2016-04-18 20:22

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. In the manuscript entitled "Hydatid Cyst of the Gallbladder: A systematic review of the literature" the authors analyzed the findings of 16 cases of gallbladder hydatid cysts. 2. The authors had not presented their own cases. This is a literature review on the topic of gallbladder hydatid cyst. Usually the reviewer is expected to present their cases in addition to the literature search. Without an experience on this cases it is not very interesting to write a review article. 3. The discussion is superficial and not very informative