



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Manuscript NO:** 50875

**Title:** Colorectal surgeon consensus with hemorrhoid clinical practice guidelines

**Reviewer's code:** 03001816

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Author's country:** Australia

**Reviewer chosen by:** Jia-Ping Yan

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-08-20 11:35

**Reviewer performed review:** 2019-08-20 15:02

**Review time:** 3 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

This study evaluates to what degree colorectal surgeons in Australia and New Zealand



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

agree with and apply clinical practice guidelines for hemorrhoid treatment. Seventeen clinical scenarios were provided, with choices, including the current guidelines, and responses were recorded and analyzed. 47% of the scenarios showed considerable disagreement among physicians, and one other scenario, a majority disagreed with the guidelines. The areas of disagreement (among physicians - leading to "equipoise" - less than 70% consensus, and also in one case 87% disagreed with the guidelines) were associated with low to moderate evidence. The authors suggest these to be areas of future research. This is a useful study to delineate those areas in the field that require stronger evidence for guidelines. The paper is acceptable for publication. One optional suggestion would be for the authors to expand a bit more on the correlation between disagreement and quality of evidence. It would seem that the former derives from the latter; that there is insufficient evidence backing some of these guidelines so as to convince more than 70% of the physicians to agree with current guidelines. A conclusion could be to specifically prioritize evidence quality for those guidelines. Perhaps as well, as a follow-up, interrogate the physicians as to the reasons for their disagreement.

#### **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

##### ***Google Search:***

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

##### ***BPG Search:***

- The same title



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](https://www.wjgnet.com)

Duplicate publication

Plagiarism

No



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Manuscript NO:** 50875

**Title:** Colorectal surgeon consensus with hemorrhoid clinical practice guidelines

**Reviewer's code:** 03538879

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Chief Doctor, Professor

**Reviewer's country:** China

**Author's country:** Australia

**Reviewer chosen by:** Jia-Ping Yan

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-09-06 23:10

**Reviewer performed review:** 2019-09-10 02:38

**Review time:** 3 Days and 3 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

This is a nice study investigating clinical practitioners' responses to current medical



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

guidelines. I only have two questions. Firstly, I suggest authors revise the title, indicating the study was a survey. Current title may be misunderstood as an expert consensus statement of hemorrhoid management. Secondly, the number of respondents were the main concern. Only 82 gave responses. Indeed, this number is not identical, like authors mentioned in the limitation. In addition, authors only investigate surgeons from the single society. I believe some surgeons may be the initiators of the clinical practice guideline. This may lead to extra bias of the investigation. And what about the opinion outside the society? The general applicability of the conclusion may also be uncertain.

#### **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

##### ***Google Search:***

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

##### ***BPG Search:***

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No