

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 79779

Title: Laparoscopic treatment of pyogenic liver abscess caused by fishbone puncture through the stomach wall and into the liver: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 00058381

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Austria

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-09-07

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-09-22 07:54

Reviewer performed review: 2022-09-22 12:20

Review time: 4 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] Anonymous [<input type="radio"/>] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [<input type="radio"/>] Yes [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] No
-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Major Comments: (1) Although no ground-breaking innovations are presented, this manuscript offers an interesting case report and illustrative pictures. (2) More details on the laparoscopic technique (number and location of the ports used, etc.) should be given. (3) Follow-up information should be added within the text. (4) Please check the units ("HCO₃- 12.7 mmHg?") Additional Comments/Suggestions: (5) Line 17: "performed the surgical" -> performed the surgical procedure. (6) Line 20: "contributed to manuscript Revision" - > contributed to manuscript revision. (7) Line 38: "and, septic shock" -> and septic shock. (8) Lines 48-51: "Although liver abscess caused by foreign bodies are rarely seen, they should still be considered as potential causes of abscesses and need attention. It usually requires surgical treatment, our case prove that a laparoscopic approach to the abscess is very useful." -> Although liver abscesses caused by foreign bodies are rarely seen, they should still be considered as potential causes and need attention. This condition usually requires surgical treatment and our case proves that a laparoscopic approach is very useful. (9) Lines 73-74: "A male patient, 56 years old, complained of 'intermittent chest tightness and shortness of breath for 7 days, aggravating for 1 day', was admitted..." -> A male patient, 56 years old, complaining of 'intermittent chest tightness and shortness of breath for 7 days, aggravating for 1 day', was admitted... (10) Line 94: "In the Intensive Care Unit, the patient was transferred back to the general ward..." -> From the Intensive Care Unit, the patient was transferred back to the general ward... (11) Line 100: "who was returned to the Intensive Care Unit again" -> and was returned to the Intensive Care Unit again. (12) Lines 102 and 103: "MDT" -> MDD. (13) Lines 124-125: "The etiology of liver abscess is the purulent lesions of the liver caused by

various microorganisms such as bacteria, fungi or amoeba histolytica" -> Liver abscesses are purulent lesions of the liver caused by various microorganisms such as bacteria, fungi or Entamoeba histolytica. (14) Line 138: "Lambert [4] have reported..." -> Lambert [4] has reported... (15) Lines 148-149: "Liver abscess is a disease well known to clinicians, and their clinical manifestations are diverse" -> Liver abscess is a disease well known to clinicians, and its clinical manifestations are diverse. (16) Lines 194-195: "have been successfully removed after exploratory laparotomy, of which in 2 cases has been removed by laparoscopy" -> have been successfully removed after exploratory laparotomy, in 2 of them by laparoscopy. (17) Line 286 (Figure Legend 1): "Images of the high-density foreign body was marked with a red arrow" -> The high-density foreign body was marked with a red arrow. (18) In spite of language editing, there are some stylistic/linguistic problems (perhaps changes were made after the editing process or the authors did not take up all the suggestions).

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 79779

Title: Laparoscopic treatment of pyogenic liver abscess caused by fishbone puncture through the stomach wall and into the liver: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02845080

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: DNB, FICS, FRCS (Gen Surg), MBBS, MMed, MNAMS, MS

Professional title: Associate Professor, Director, Surgical Oncologist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Singapore

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-09-07

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-09-28 22:55

Reviewer performed review: 2022-10-06 17:08

Review time: 7 Days and 18 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
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" 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

1. The authors have used superlatives and conjectures to enhance the impact and this is not in keeping with scientific writing. For example, in abstract, i shall point the following 4 points. In the rest of the manuscript, there are many such issues and i request authors to moderate the tone and keep it simple, factual and trim the language additives. (a) heavy consequences if not diagnosed ---- just consequence. Or could say it can contribute to morbidity etc (b) caused an uncontrollable liver abscess - just state liver abscess (c) symptoms were significantly improved - just say the abscess resolved or symptoms improved (d) laparoscopic approach to the abscess is very useful - just mention that it is safe and feasible or useful. I hope authors can figure out what i am trying to convey. Please edit accordingly in entire manuscript. The above 4 examples are in abstract section.

2. In case report description you mention - loss of consciousness without obvious incentive. What does it mean? What is without incentive? Do you mean to convey that without obvious cause or explanation? Pls modify.

3. Double pneumonia - is wrong. Can put as bilateral pneumonia.

4. Square lobe of the liver - is wrong. There is nothing called square lobe. Pls describe in terms of segmental anatomy e.g. segment III or segment IV (i suspect you mean to convey quadrate lobe, but still this is not current accepted terminology)

5. Lactic acidosis is not a diagnosis. You already have septic shock in diagnosis. Lactic acidosis is included in septic shock and so omit it.

6. Did the original CT scan report - radiologist doctor reported on the "linear density" or some terminology to describe possible foreign body or a fish bone? Or the radiologist missed this and only during MDT discussion it was detected? Pls mention this clearly in the description.

7. In the operative description you mention - patient's pylorus and

hepatic hilum were obviously adherent --- well they were adherent or densely adherent. There is no obvious adherent. Edit this. 8. In operative description - white long 2cm long -- long is repeated twice. Edit this. 9. Length of stay? when was drain removed? any bile leak? what's the duration - interval of your followup? All this has to be included please 10. First statement of intro is wrong - etiology of liver abscess is the purulent lesions of the liver ---- liver abscess itself is purulent lesion. So aetiology is bacterial fungal etc. The word purulent is wrong. You also should use the term pyogenic liver abscess and coin acronym PLA rather than stating "liver abscess". Pls make this change in title, abstract and entire manuscript. 11. Another statement - Foreign body triggers are very rare. This is also wrong. It is not a "trigger". It is a causative agent. It is aetiology and not a trigger. Edit and rephrase this. 12. Diagnosis is also difficult as patients sometimes don't give history of foreign body ingestion as it is few days ago and they may not consider it relevant. Also the foreign body is not visible on X-rays. Sometimes it is also not visible on CT scans! Pls add all this in discussion. 13. I have witnessed two situations (both not reported by me as in Singapore this is fairly common problem). In one situation, we did not operate but simply did percutaneous drain and the patient did not have recurrent issues as generally a layer of fibrosis/granulation/calcification develops around the foreign body and possibly it is digested away too. This is similar to gunshot pellets where we don't have to remove each and every pellet! In my other case, I tried laparoscopic surgery but did not find the foreign body. I converted to open, I could not find. I found dense adhesions between stomach and liver, but only found pus but no foreign body even with open conversion and spending a lot of time to find it (a frustrating experience for me). Patient recovered well. So in short I am telling this experience to convey the message that your discussion has to be moderated. The removal of foreign body is not "must do" thing though intuitively it makes sense to remove it as a potential source; but in practice it can be left alone without dire

consequences. Thus, you could simple do percutaneous drainage and antibiotics and save the patient a surgery. This all has to be discussed. 14. Trim conclusion to 2-3 statement and not so long and redundant. 15. You should include what bacteria was grown from pus or blood culture. What was sensitivity. What was the duration of antibiotics you gave. 11.