



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

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 17862

Title: Laparoscopic vs mini-incision open appendectomy: A prospective study

Reviewer's code: 03036220

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Jing Yu

Date sent for review: 2015-03-28 17:47

Date reviewed: 2015-04-10 14:25

| CLASSIFICATION | LANGUAGE EVALUATION | SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT | CONCLUSION |
|---|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing | Google Search: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title | <input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good | | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision |
| | | BPG Search: | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism | |
| | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | |

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I think that this is a good work! As I demonstrated in a recent paper (Surg Laparosc Endosc Percutan Tech. 2014 Oct;24(5):406-9), laparoscopic appendectomy (LA) is not associated with a lower complication rate than open appendectomy (OA) but LA is more expensive than the OA. Did you find some economical differences between the two groups? In that work, during LA, we used a vascular stapler for the mesoappendix and an intestinal stapler for the appendix and not loop as you. But, did you consider the economical point of view? Thanks



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

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 17862

Title: Laparoscopic vs mini-incision open appendectomy: A prospective study

Reviewer's code: 03035236

Reviewer's country: Brazil

Science editor: Jing Yu

Date sent for review: 2015-03-28 17:47

Date reviewed: 2015-04-11 09:43

| CLASSIFICATION | LANGUAGE EVALUATION | SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT | CONCLUSION |
|--|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing | Google Search: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title | <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"/> Duplicate publication | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism | <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor | | [Y] No | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision |
| | | BPG Search: | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism | |
| | | [Y] No | |

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The presented manuscript, a prospective randomized study and related to high incidence disease, has a great importance since the results and conclusions can orient the management of treatment of a high number of patients. There are just some outlined comments in order to improve the scientific consistency of your work.