

## ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 11760

**Title:** Clinical Characteristics of Incidental or Unsuspected Gallbladder Cancers Diagnosed During or After Cholecystectomy: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

**Reviewer code:** 00504727

**Science editor:** Yuan Qi

**Date sent for review:** 2014-06-03 20:05

**Date reviewed:** 2014-06-11 18:23

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

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors present a meta-analysis of incidentally found gallbladder cancer following cholecystectomy. They evaluated a total of 26 studies with over 2,100 patients included in their analysis. Because cholecystectomy is such a common surgical entity, this study provides some basis and weight to the fact that benign surgical diseases can present as malignancies with dire outcomes. However, one major missing piece of data and discussion from this paper is the actual survival length & mortality of the patients included in the analysis. While the incidence of GB cancer found incidentally is important, how this impacts patients' survival seems a necessary component that merits results & discussion. ? Figure 2 does not provide much information, other than to show the very low incidence of incidental GB cancer, 0.7%, which you state in multiple places in the manuscript. This figure may be left out. ? While you describe some of the definitions of TNM staging in your results, the paragraph is a bit confusing (e.g. you don't describe T1a vs b or T2). Please clarify the current guidelines for Tis through T4 (each) in addition to some of the modifications you list over the various AJCC editions. ? The Results paragraph "Revisional Surgery for Radical Chole" contains mostly discussion and, as such, should be moved from Results to the Discussion section of the manuscript. ? Additional extrapolation and impact on society would add some weight to the study, such as including the total number of cholecystectomies performed in the world/US/Korea/etc, which may result in \_\_\_ number of GB cancers found incidentally.

## ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 11760

**Title:** Clinical Characteristics of Incidental or Unsuspected Gallbladder Cancers Diagnosed During or After Cholecystectomy: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

**Reviewer code:** 02839989

**Science editor:** Yuan Qi

**Date sent for review:** 2014-06-03 20:05

**Date reviewed:** 2014-06-12 01:30

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

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Would change language in conclusion about additional imaging "might" be necessary for revisional surgery to something more definitive.