

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

ESPS Manuscript NO: 5203

Title: Treatment of perforated giant gastric ulcer in emergency setting

Reviewer code: 02459013

Science editor: Wen, Ling-Ling

Date sent for review: 2013-08-22 20:34

Date reviewed: 2013-09-25 00:02

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this manuscript the authors reported experience of treatment of 20 patients with perforated giant gastric ulcer in emergency setting. The study is interesting. However, I have some comments. 1. Abstract a. The authors stated that the aim of this study is to study and compare various modes of treatment for perforated giant gastric ulcer in emergency setting. However, no comparison was shown in the study. "The aim of this study is to assess the clinical outcomes of various treatment for perforated giant gastric ulcer in emergency setting" may be more appropriated. b. Description of results is the same as the methods in some degree. 2. Materials and Methods a. What about the details of the operations reported in this study? b. More baseline data of 20 patients (blood pressure, blood test....) should be reported. c. What is the endpoint used for assessing the clinical outcomes? d. What about the postprocedural Management? e. Some of the current section should be moved to results section. 3. Results a. Why the authors reported the distribution of patients according to age of the patients/ distribution of patients according to sex of the patients. What do these data account for? b. There was no uneventful recovery rate, complications rate and mortality rate being reported in this section. 4. Discussion The authors should added some description about different influence of different treatments on the clinical outcome of patients with perforated giant gastric ulcer.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

ESPS Manuscript NO: 5203

Title: Treatment of perforated giant gastric ulcer in emergency setting

Reviewer code: 02572232

Science editor: Wen, Ling-Ling

Date sent for review: 2013-08-22 20:34

Date reviewed: 2013-09-26 23:00

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 type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	language polishing	BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. The choice of treatment for perforated gastric ulcer depends on the disease duration. A simple closure of the ulcer perforation is appropriate if it is more than 8 hours. 2. the group of primary closure was too small. 3. Participants should be randomly assigned to receive primary closure or partial distal gastrectomy and gastrojejunostomy. 4. the discussion should be conducted around the theme.