

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Respiriology

ESPS manuscript NO: 14327

Title: Primary pneumothorax: Should surgery be offered after the first episode?

Reviewer's code: 00711004

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2014-09-29 21:24

Date reviewed: 2014-11-13 13:35

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" 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"/> 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 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

This manuscript presents a review regarding whether VATS (video assisted thoracic surgery) should be offered for all patients with first episode of PSP (primary spontaneous pneumothorax). This is an interesting and debating topic. Current practice tends to treat stable PSP patients with conservative observation and/or needle aspiration because PSP is barely life-threatening, and recommends VATS for patients with recurrent episode of PSP. Some studies ([67]) demonstrated that VATS is not only effective in the treatment of PSP, but also in the prevention of recurrent PSP. The question is whether we should offer VATS for all patients with first episode of PSP. The authors tried to answer this questions by reviewing studies related to this topic. 1) The writing style of the manuscript is more like an essay or expert opinions. It is suggested that the authors may re-organize the manuscript in terms of the structure of a scientific or clinical review: such as introduction, current status and debates, recent major advances, revisit current management, future research topics, and conclusion or learning points. In addition, it is recommended to reduce the subjective opinions from the authors instead adding more objective data or tables from existing studies. 2) This review lacks of a section regarding the current (state-of-the-art) clinical management guidelines and the



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>

recommended treatments for PSP, which is categorized in terms of the stability and the acuteness of the patient, the size and the recurrence of PSP, etc. VATS is only one of the recommended treatments for PSP under certain conditions. By a discussion of the shortcomings of current management of PSP, it makes sense to revisit and thus revise the current management scheme for PSP. 3) Is it a general consensus that VAST should be clinically offered to all PSP patients including first and recurrent episodes? If not, please discuss other opinions and the status of any multi-centric clinical trials on this topic if any. minor comments: 1) P3, last paragraph: "the prevailing dogma is the medical ..." check the sentence.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Respiriology

ESPS manuscript NO: 14327

Title: Primary pneumothorax: Should surgery be offered after the first episode?

Reviewer's code: 00608210

Reviewer's country: Thailand

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2014-09-29 21:24

Date reviewed: 2014-11-03 10:50

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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

I suggest revising this review. This is a review, not expert's opinion. Therefore, the authors should give more detail and summarize about pro and con of conservative management of PSP. The authors should compare in numeric of conservative management vs blebs excision vs blebs excision + pleurodesis vs pleurodesis. Moreover, please compare the success rate in numeric of medical and surgical pleurodesis. In addition, please provide the success rate in numeric of new surgical techniques (page 4-8). Besides, the authors should review data by themselves, not review of the review (for example; the natural history of PSP in page 10).

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Respiriology

ESPS manuscript NO: 14327

Title: Primary pneumothorax: Should surgery be offered after the first episode?

Reviewer's code: 00608185

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2014-09-29 21:24

Date reviewed: 2014-11-11 06:46

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" 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"/> 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

This manuscript was interesting, however, there were few data to show whether immediate operation was necessary or not. The author should demonstrate above points through the comprehensive tables or figures.