

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Hepatology*

Manuscript NO: 69138

Title: Timing of surgical repair of bile duct injuries after laparoscopic cholecystectomy:
A systematic review

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05467628

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MBBS

Professional title: Doctor, Research Fellow

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: Germany

Manuscript submission date: 2021-06-19

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-06-26 04:49

Reviewer performed review: 2021-06-27 06:00

Review time: 1 Day and 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

Peer-reviewer statements	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 is an interesting systematic review evaluating the evidence behind management of bile duct injuries (BDI). While the manuscript has its strengths, given below are my comments in no particular order.

1. Very similar systematic review was published last year in annals of surgery - "Early Versus Delayed Surgical Repair and Referral for Patients With Bile Duct Injury: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis" <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32106173/> Another review was published in BJS Open in 2020 "Optimal timing for surgical reconstruction of bile duct injury: meta-analysis" <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32852893/>
2. In such a scenario when extremely similar articles have already been published, it is critical that authors ensure that their manuscript avoids any methodological issues and incorporates their findings. Unfortunately, authors have not discussed the results of either of these two reviews.
3. Search strategy is 1.5 years old. Old search strategy decreases the value of the systematic review. Authors may wish to rerun the search and make it up-to-date.
4. Abstract has not been written appropriately and needs to be revised. The second sentence of the 'background section', i.e. the aim, is not what the authors are doing. Authors have written "The aim of this study was to review the recommendations on the timing for BDI repair after LC in literature." However, the actual aim is to systematically evaluate the evidence behind the repair of bile duct injury. Recommendations are issued by professional societies after conducting their own systematic reviews.
4. Title should be rephrased to explicitly mention that this is a systematic review.
5. Authors should look at PRISMA-A checklist to see how to rewrite their abstract to include the key information at a glance.
6. PRISMA 2009 is the oldest version. Kindly provide PRISMA

2020 checklist and the supporting PRISMA 2020 flowchart for this paper. The current flowchart has wrong terminology listed (e.g. manual reading is not a terminology to be used). 7. Figure 1 doesn't provide search strategy as the authors claim in their paper. Figure 1 is somewhat like the PRISMA 2009 flowchart albeit with wrong terminology. Kindly provide exact search strategy as supplementary material (with the BOOLEAN operators and Mesh terms) 8. No mention of risk of bias assessment in the methods section. Authors have not performed risk of bias assessment which is the backbone of systematic review. Please use either newcastle ottawa scale or ROBINS-I tool to do risk of bias assessment and then resubmit. 9. Authors have mixed up screening and data extraction subheadings in one section. Kindly separate out. Kindly see the annals of surgery paper above on how to write a better methods section. 10. Inclusion criteria are poorly written. No mention of whether or not language restriction was there. No mention of time (e.g. including all studies ever published). 11. Systematic review was not pre-registered at PROSPERO. 12. Authors have not explicitly stated their major and minor outcomes to be analyzed in methods section. In summary, kindly revise and provide all the missing material and resubmit so that the manuscript may then be further evaluated.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Hepatology*

Manuscript NO: 69138

Title: Timing of surgical repair of bile duct injuries after laparoscopic cholecystectomy:
A systematic review

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03475120

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: FACS, MD, PhD

Professional title: Chief Doctor, Director, Doctor, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: Germany

Manuscript submission date: 2021-06-19

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-06-27 23:32

Reviewer performed review: 2021-07-05 00:09

Review time: 7 Days

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<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
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] Anonymous [<input type="radio"/>] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [<input type="radio"/>] Yes [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] No
-------------------------------------	---

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This paper is well written, but important reliable papers should be listed in the Reference section. Please quote important reliable papers in your review. 1. de'Angelis N, et al. 2020 WSES guidelines for the detection and management of bile duct injury during cholecystectomy. World J Emerg Surg 2021;16(1):30 2. Helmi Khadra, et al. Bile duct injury repairs: Progressive outcomes in a tertiary referral center. Surgery 2019;166(4):698-702. 3. Hori T, et al. Protocol for laparoscopic cholecystectomy: Is it rocket science? World J Gastroenterol 2016;22(47):10287-10303.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Hepatology*

Manuscript NO: 69138

Title: A Systematic Review of Surgical Repair of Bile Duct Injuries After Laparoscopic Cholecystectomy – Conditions To Consider

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05467628

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MBBS

Professional title: Doctor, Research Fellow

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: Germany

Manuscript submission date: 2021-06-19

Reviewer chosen by: Man Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-11-16 12:49

Reviewer performed review: 2021-11-16 13:07

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<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
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I had provided several comments, most of which have been adhered to. Manuscript has been definitively improved. However, I have some additional remarks: 1. Title should be modified in line with modern terminology of systematic reviews: "Timing of Surgical Repair of Bile Duct Injuries After Laparoscopic Cholecystectomy: A Systematic Review"

2. In methods section, please say 'risk of bias' not just 'bias'. 3. Studies excluded from full-text must have specific reason for exclusion, which has not been added yet. See Cochrane Handbook for Guidance. 4. Please use the PRISMA 2020 Flowchart template, don't make your own template. The current figure is confusing with regards to separation of steps of abstract and full text screening. 5. Please upload list of excluded studies from full-text screening as a supplementary file.