

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Critical Care Medicine

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 29568

**Title:** Risk factors for mortality in postoperative peritonitis in critically ill patients

**Reviewer's code:** 00053888

**Reviewer's country:** United Kingdom

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2016-08-23 13:42

**Date reviewed:** 2016-08-23 20:52

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	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

This is an interesting study of patients being admitted to ICU with a post operative surgical complication. The study is retrospective but based on prospective collected data. The authors have demonstrated that the presence of co-morbid conditions, the number of re-operations required and one of three scoring systems predict a poor outcome. It is perhaps a little strange that only 1 of the 3 scoring systems predicts a poor outcome but this might simply be either an effect of numbers or the variation in the patients being studied. None of this is surprising but never the less this is a large study and has put the long held surgical belief into a scientific outcome. This paper is worthy of publication, there is a small amount of editorial work required.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Critical Care Medicine

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 29568

**Title:** Risk factors for mortality in postoperative peritonitis in critically ill patients

**Reviewer's code:** 00051373

**Reviewer's country:** Taiwan

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2016-08-23 13:42

**Date reviewed:** 2016-08-23 22:12

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	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

This retrospective study performed from a prospective data base analysed the risk factor of mortality in 201 patients admitted for POP in a surgical intensive care unit. The current manuscript is written well and easily to understand. I believed that it should be accept for publication without alter.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Critical Care Medicine

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 29568

**Title:** Risk factors for mortality in postoperative peritonitis in critically ill patients

**Reviewer's code:** 02551436

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2016-08-23 13:42

**Date reviewed:** 2016-09-05 07:45

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"/> 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

This is a well written paper with a very relevant topic. It is well researched . I strongly recommend this paper

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Critical Care Medicine

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 29568

**Title:** Risk factors for mortality in postoperative peritonitis in critically ill patients

**Reviewer's code:** 00505477

**Reviewer's country:** Israel

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2016-08-23 13:42

**Date reviewed:** 2016-09-08 17:31

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" 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"/> 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	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

please go over the article and correct the paragraphings and concise the chapters.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Critical Care Medicine

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 29568

**Title:** Risk factors for mortality in postoperative peritonitis in critically ill patients

**Reviewer's code:** 00505493

**Reviewer's country:** Italy

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2016-08-23 13:42

**Date reviewed:** 2016-09-26 18:25

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" 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 read with great interest this paper about an hot topic built on a retrospective analysis of a large database . The aim of the paper is to individualized risk factors for mortality in patients affected by post-operative peritonitis after abdominal surgery . Some considerations must be done ! General considerations : The Authors analyzed , initially, data coming from the ICU charts and they affirm that the study is irrespective of the first surgical procedure . Then they analyzed the quality of the second operation conducted for post- op peritonitis . In this view i observed a large SD in the delay column(tab 2) between first operation and surgical reintervention . In my opinion the Stratification of data is quite lacking because the p- value is not significative but seems evident that a large delay in re-operation could affect the out come ,moreover the clinical experience says that dehiscence of esophago-gastric junction is more difficult to manage compared to colo-rectal dehiscence . So, conceptually, patients are not comparable ! In the introduction Authors affirm that post-operative peritonitis is difficult to diagnose cause low sensibility as of biological parameters just like clinical parameters. But this is a multivariate analysis and any conclusion failed if one of all items , currently considered in the management of sepsis , are not collected and analyzed. For



## 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](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

---

istance data regarding PCR , procalcitonin and resepsin are lacking so the paper seems , in my opinion, to result incomplete.