

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Ms: 2380

Title: Gallbladder polyps: ‘Factors affecting surgical decision’

Reviewer code: 02411099

Science editor: l.l.wen@wjgnet.com

Date sent for review: 2013-02-19 19:43

Date reviewed: 2013-02-19 21:59

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existed	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS:

I sincerely appreciated this study, but it needs some minor review in my opinion: - The distinction in "pseudopolyps" and "real polyps" is not well explained: adenomas (adenomatous polyps has in fact the same meaning) are present in both categories. Please correct (text and graphic) - A distinction is due between multiple and single polyps, as the indication uniformly accepted for surgery is multiple polyps > 5mm or single polyp > 1cm. Does your study confirm these guidelines? - a conclusion on your way of treating a patient with a diagnosis of polyps must be enhanced with a flow chart.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Ms: 2380

Title: Gallbladder polyps: ‘Factors affecting surgical decision’

Reviewer code: 00071092

Science editor: l.l.wen@wjgnet.com

Date sent for review: 2013-02-19 19:43

Date reviewed: 2013-02-19 23:55

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS:

Manuscript which was written on a subject of considerable controversy in general surgery has been generally well-designed. Title accurately reflects the study topic. In the abstract, the incidence of malignancy should be written. In keywords section, gallbladder and polyps words should be united and should be written in the form of gallbladder polyps. Introduction, materials and methods, results, and discussion are sufficient and well-organized according to the rules of journal. However, the conclusion in the last paragraph should be rewritten as a highlighter. Typos in Table I must be corrected. The journal has the figures and tables captions. In the materials and methods, the word "picture" should be corrected as "figure". I would advise that the manuscript should be reviewed by a native English speaker.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Ms: 2380

Title: Gallbladder polyps: ‘Factors affecting surgical decision’

Reviewer code: 00070915

Science editor: l.l.wen@wjgnet.com

Date sent for review: 2013-02-19 19:43

Date reviewed: 2013-02-20 17:34

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existed	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS:

The manuscript is generally well-written and confirms the findings of previous studies on the subject. Although the authors add no further knowledge to the subject of clinical decision-making of gallbladder polyps, they provide a concise retrospective study. The authors conclude that the main factors affecting the decision are age, size and number of polyps. The first 2 factors are extensively analyzed in the results and discussion sections. The number of polyps is only presented in Table 1 but results are neither presented nor discussed adequately. Extensive presentation of results in the Discussion section should be avoided. Similarly, reference to results presented in Table 1 should be directed from the Results section only. Text revision by a native English speaker is recommended due to spelling and syntax errors.