

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 12515

Title: Review of the treatment of liver hydatid cysts

Reviewer code: 02453015

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2014-07-13 20:28

Date reviewed: 2014-07-13 23:53

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"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input checked="" 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"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The topic is interesting. Major concerns: 1. Introduction, the Aim and Novelty of the study are missing. 2. Are all key words for searching literature necessary, such as retrospective and prospective? More key words might lead to fewer papers found. 3. It is not clear who performed literature search and who extracted data. What happened if there is no agreement on the quality of the enrolled study? 4. Tables 3 and 4 did not contain any information of the present research and should be deleted. 5. A flow chart showing the inclusion and exclusion of studies at each step is highly recommended. 6. Results, the authors can reduce the description of each enrolled study by using Tables. 7. English needs to be improved, especially as a review article.

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 12515

Title: Review of the treatment of liver hydatid cysts

Reviewer code: 02527808

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2014-07-13 20:28

Date reviewed: 2014-07-27 10:24

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input checked="" 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"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This article is valuable one in this field but some remarks was noted: - The submitted manuscript with end note correction is not accepted - Language editing is nedded - A breif introduction about the mode of infection,pathology &clinical presentation is better added. - The results of metaanalysis are better presented in tables,

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 12515

Title: Review of the treatment of liver hydatid cysts

Reviewer code: 02526287

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2014-07-13 20:28

Date reviewed: 2014-07-29 01:40

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"/> Existing	<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	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The paper entitled "Review of Liver Hydatid cyst" by Gomez I Gavara et al has been deeply reviewed. The authors did an extensive and meticulous research work on the literature and the information provided are of great interest. However the paper is poorly organized and it needs to be extensively modified in its assembling. In the present version it looks like a cross between a metanalysis and a literature review. In addition the paper is too long and it needs to be drastically shortened. A review should to be organized in several paragraphs addressing the topics the authors consider relevant. Material and methods section is not required and the criteria adopted for literature selection is redundant. Tables may help understanding what the literature offers on a specific argument and limits and drawbacks of a single scientific paper should be addressed in the text. Each paragraph should end with a sort of summary and a final paragraph including the main authors conclusions should be included. Major comments 1- Materials and methods, and results sections should be deleted. Each paragraph on results section should become a part of the whole text. Avoid to detail materials and methods of every paper included (they should be specified in a table if necessary) focusing only on the main messages provided and on discrepancies if any. 2- Table 1 and 2 should be condensed into a single table. Abbreviations used in the table should be better specified. 3- Tables 3 and 4 are redundant 4- Two tables including data on medical and surgical approaches may help summarizing evidence-based role of these two treatments 5- First sentence in Discussion should be moved to introduction. Minor comments Language and style are good enough even



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>

though a mother tongue revision should be advisable. Some printing errors are still present

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 12515

Title: Review of the treatment of liver hydatid cysts

Reviewer code: 02441729

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2014-07-13 20:28

Date reviewed: 2014-07-29 10:42

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"/> Existing	<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"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Although there are few systematic reviews concerning hydatid cyst with most of them involving a specific geographical area; I think that this manuscript is not well written with few tables and no figures or charts showing how the study was conducted or highlighting conclusions.