



ESPS JOURNAL EDITOR-IN-CHIEF'S REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 14772

Title: Hepatobiliary complications of alveolar echinococcosis: A long-term follow-up study

Journal Editor-in-Chief (Associate Editor): Nahum Mendez-Sanchez

Country: Mexico

Editorial Director: Jin-Lei Wang

Date sent for review: 2015-01-12 13:18

Date reviewed: 2015-01-14 01:03

ACADEMIC CONTENT EVALUATION	LANGUAGE QUALITY EVALUATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection

JOURNAL EDITOR-IN-CHIEF (ASSOCIATE EDITOR) COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

ESPS Manuscript NO: 14772 Title: Hepatobiliary complications of alveolar echinococcosis: A long-term follow-up study Comments: The authors ‘ objective Page 6, introduction section, last paragraph. Authors wrote The authors ‘ objective. But it is not. It is the objective study. Also at the present form is too long. I suggest to change it by the objective of the study was to describe the clinical, biochemical and outcomes of patients ….. Also I suggest to delete the first two lines of this paragraph (The present study reports the outcomes of 35 patients…). Because that information is included in the material and methods section Page 7, material and methods section. A lot of information is missing. Authors need to mention that they include demographic, clinical, biochemical, endoscopic, etc. In the same section the statistical analysis section is confusing (two different paragraphs) Page 8 results section. At the present form it is too long. Why authors did not use a table to describe the main characteristics of 35 patients. Also the content of the table 1 it is not useful they can write it.

Answering:

1. Page 6, introduction section, last paragraph. Authors wrote The authors’ objective. But it is not. It is the objective study. Also at the present form is too long. I suggest to change it by the objective of the study was to describe the clinical, biochemical and outcomes of patients ….. Also I suggest to delete



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>

the first two lines of this paragraph (The present study reports the outcomes of 35 patients...). Because that information is included in the material and methods section.

As recommended by the editor we changed the formulation of our study objective. We have also deleted the first two lines of this section.

2. Page 7, material and methods section. A lot of information is missing. Authors need to mention that they include demographic, clinical, biochemical, endoscopic, etc.

As suggested we added the missing information into the appropriate section.

In the same section the statistical analysis section is confusing (two different paragraphs)

We agree with the editor that this section is listed two times. We have summarized this sections.

3. Page 8 results section. At the present form it is too long. Why authors did not use a table to describe the main characteristics of 35 patients. Also the content of the table 1 it is not useful they can write it.

As recommended by the reviewer we shortened the results paragraph by adding some results into tables. In addition, the content of table 1 have been listed in the text.