

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

Manuscript NO: 85943

Title: Diagnosis and treatment of post-cholecystectomy diarrhoea

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 04091933 Position: Editorial Board Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Senior Researcher

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Russia

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-05-23

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-05-23 13:51

Reviewer performed review: 2023-06-05 23:20

Review time: 13 Days and 9 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No creativity or innovation



https://www.wjgnet.com

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript's topic is relevant in connection with the widespread use of cholecystectomy worldwide. However, the subject is not fully disclosed by the authors. There is clearly not enough epidemiological data in the manuscript that is required to emphasize the importance of postoperative diarrhea. The manuscript is titled "Diagnosis and Treatment of Postcholecystectomy Diarrhea", but the diagnosis, which is not very simple and important, is given in no more than 2 sentences. The treatment is disclosed in sufficient detail, but there are not enough recent publications (2023). It is recommended 1) to include a section on epidemiology and risk factors (see, for example, Farrugia A et al, 2022); 2) to review the BAD pathogenesis, including the role of the gut microbiota (e.g., Xu Y et al, 2022, 2023; Kumar A et al., 2023), and briefly discuss other causes of postcholecystectomy diarrhea besides BAD; 3) to include a section on diagnosis, discussing underdiagnosis and delay in diagnosis (see, for example, Farrugia A et al, 2021), and the possibility of routinely using more straightforward fecal bile acid tests instead of the SeHCAT test that is not always available; 4) when discussing treatment, it is recommended to separate approaches that are already available in routine practice



https://www.wjgnet.com

and future approaches that are only being developed; 5) it is recommended to add tables (for example, with diagnostic tests and treatment options) and figures (for example, algorithms for diagnosis and treatment/management of patients with postcholecystectomy diarrhea); 6) it is recommended to add the latest scientific publications (2022-2023). The manuscript may be recommended for publication after a major revision.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

Manuscript NO: 85943

Title: Diagnosis and treatment of post-cholecystectomy diarrhoea

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 04105454 Position: Editorial Board Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Egypt

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-05-23

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

 $\textbf{Reviewer accepted review:}\ 2023\text{-}06\text{-}25\ 16\text{:}55$

Reviewer performed review: 2023-06-25 17:39

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C:
	Good
	[] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No creativity or innovation



Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

it is well written review article highlight the problem and discuss the psychophysiology and its implications on treatment



RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

Manuscript NO: 85943

Title: Diagnosis and treatment of post-cholecystectomy diarrhoea

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 04091933 Position: Editorial Board Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Senior Researcher

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Russia

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-05-23

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ping Yan

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-07-25 10:24

Reviewer performed review: 2023-07-25 15:39

Review time: 5 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous
statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No



SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The overall quality of the manuscript has improved significantly, including the addition of recent references. Unfortunately, the authors ignored the reviewer's recommendations to add informative tables and figures. The absence of illustrative material will make it difficult to read the article, but generally, it will not significantly degrade its quality.