

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 84132

**Title:** Current opinions on the use of therapeutic anticoagulation for splanchnic vein thrombosis in acute pancreatitis: A survey and case-vignette study in the Netherlands

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05226306

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** FACS, MBBS, MCh, MNAMS

**Professional title:** Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** India

**Author's Country/Territory:** Netherlands

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-03-06

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-03-07 03:20

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-03-07 12:40

**Review time:** 9 Hours

Scientific quality	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="radio"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="radio"/> Grade C: Good <input type="radio"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="radio"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="radio"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="radio"/> Grade B: Good <input type="radio"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="radio"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="radio"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="radio"/> Grade B: Good <input type="radio"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="radio"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<b>Language quality</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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. "This proportion of untreated patients is substantially higher.." If the study was targeting the reasons for lesser usage, the questionnaire could have addressed the same
2. "Based on the available literature, it remains unclear whether therapeutic anticoagulation is associated with higher rates of bleeding". The statement is negated by the ref(no 18 -"therapeutic anticoagulation resulted in recanalization of the involved vessels without significantly increasing the risk of bleeding complications")
3. The possible risks / complications could have been quantified to assess the rationale behind the "nonprescribing trend"
4. The legend description could include more details as in the manuscript
5. Factors like ICU stay / comorbidities with potential influence on the decision making could have been explored

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 84132

**Title:** Current opinions on the use of therapeutic anticoagulation for splanchnic vein thrombosis in acute pancreatitis: A survey and case-vignette study in the Netherlands

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05272457

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** China

**Author's Country/Territory:** Netherlands

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-03-06

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-03-13 02:13

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-03-17 05:02

**Review time:** 4 Days and 2 Hours

Scientific quality	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="radio"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="radio"/> Grade C: Good <input type="radio"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="radio"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="radio"/> Grade B: Good <input type="radio"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="radio"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="radio"/> Grade B: Good <input type="radio"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="radio"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<b>Language quality</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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

This article is well written article which indicate that therapeutic anticoagulation for splanchnic vein thrombosis seem to be recommended by the pancreatologists through a national survey and case-vignette study. Since the recent result of meta analysis and guideline did not support, many cases were benefit from the anticoagulation therapy. "a deeper understanding of the pathophysiology and natural course of splanchnic vein thrombosis secondary to acute pancreatitis would allow us to clarify the therapeutic role of anticoagulation." Expect the data analysis, expert consensus maybe a good guide to the clinic and basic research.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 84132

**Title:** Current opinions on the use of therapeutic anticoagulation for splanchnic vein thrombosis in acute pancreatitis: A survey and case-vignette study in the Netherlands

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 04623150

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Doctor, Research Fellow

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Hungary

**Author's Country/Territory:** Netherlands

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-03-06

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-03-15 15:03

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-03-24 16:39

**Review time:** 9 Days and 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="radio"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="radio"/> Grade C: Good <input type="radio"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="radio"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="radio"/> Grade B: Good <input type="radio"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="radio"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="radio"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="radio"/> Grade B: Good <input type="radio"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="radio"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<b>Language quality</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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

I review the article titled "Therapeutic anticoagulation for splanchnic vein thrombosis in acute pancreatitis: a national survey and case-vignette study". In this study, the authors present the results of a nationwide survey of pancreatologist about the anticoagulation use in splanchnic vein thrombosis in acute pancreatitis patients, they also included case studies and related questions.

1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? - I think the title could be changed to reflect the aim of the study or the conclusion, right now it is not so definite. E.g. Use of anticoagulation for splanchnic vein thrombosis in AP..., or Therapeutic anticoagulation with LWMH is preferred in splanchnic vein thrombosis in AP... Consider changing it.

2 Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? It is well written and contains the relevant points.

3 Key Words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? Yes, they are ok.

4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? - Length and content is adequate.

5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate

detail? YES. - DPSG and DPCG abbreviations should be mentioned first in brackets after the organization names. - statistical analysis: IBM SPSS should be cited in longer form as recommended here: <https://www.ibm.com/support/pages/how-cite-ibm-spss-statistics-or-earlier-versions-spss>

6 Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study? What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field? The results are presented clearly, the tables are well structured and easily followed.

7 Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically? Are the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner? Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper's scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently? - The discussion section is clearly presented and appropriate.

8 Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams, and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative, with labeling of figures using arrows, asterisks, etc, and are the legends adequate and accurately reflective of the images/illustrations shown? - Figures and tables are ok.

9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? Simple descriptive statistics were used which is appropriate for this survey.

10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? Ok.

11 References. Does the manuscript appropriately cite the latest, important and authoritative references in the Introduction and Discussion sections? Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references? They referenced their previous meta-analysis of the same topic which is important.

12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate? I suggest checking the manuscript for some typos (e.g. noncirrothic) British and American English should not be mixed (e.g. oesophageal vs. summarized)



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

The overall English language quality is good. 13 Research methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to BPG's standards for manuscript type and the appropriate topically-relevant category, as follows: (1) CARE Checklist (2013) - Case report; (2) CONSORT 2010 Statement - Clinical Trials study, Prospective study, Randomized Controlled trial, Randomized Clinical trial; (3) PRISMA 2009 Checklist - Evidence-Based Medicine, Systematic review, Meta-Analysis; (4) STROBE Statement - Case Control study, Observational study, Retrospective Cohort study; and (5) The ARRIVE Guidelines - Basic study. For (6) Letters to the Editor, the author(s) should have prepared the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting. Letters to the Editor will be critically evaluated and only letters with new important original or complementary information should be considered for publication. A Letter to the Editor that only recapitulates information published in the article(s) and states that more studies are needed is not acceptable? STROBE is not recommended in this study type to my knowlegde. 14 Ethics statements. For all manuscripts involving human studies and/or animal experiments, author(s) must submit the related formal ethics documents that were reviewed and approved by their local ethical review committee. Did the manuscript meet the requirements of ethics? Ethical review was waived and it is appropriate in this study type.