

Review Form2

Book Name:	Medicine and Medical Research: New Perspectives
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2871
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of validation of Anderson score for diagnosis of acute appendicitis by histopathology
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is interesting, the results could be applied in clinical practice. The work describes surgical options in acute appendicitis, a common surgical condition. The relevance and applicability of different scoring systems is a contentious issue for the scientific community, so validation study of one of the score will be met with interest by both practical doctors and researchers.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Generally yes, but it could be modified as well. I suggest "Validation of Anderson score for diagnosis of acute appendicitis by histopathology", without "evaluation".	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	I advise to remove some self-evident phrases like "Patients were operated" and unnecessary for the Abstract details like "Analysis of the data was done by SPSS software version 23". Also, I would suggest to paraphrase, for the better clarity, the sentence "But if Anderson score is <8, as per Anderson scoring system, appendicectomy should not be done, but we should not go by this" to "If the score is <8, the final decision will depend on further investigation, observation and the second opinion". Generally, I recommend the authors to avoid using strong recommendations.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Introduction: Describes clinical picture of acute appendicitis,well illustrated with picture and clinical photos. The aim of the study is clearly indicated. However, as the manuscript concerns relevance of the Anderson score, I would recommend the authors to briefly present different scores used for acute appendicitis in the current practice. It could be also nice to mention why they decided to evaluate the Anderson score, but not Alvorado score, for example. Materials and Methods: Mostly appropriate. I would like to ask the authors a question about the study period. Are there specific reasons to apply 2-year period? The size of the population is OK for the observational study, and I am not going to ask how the authors calculated the sample size (as this question could be fatal). Nonetheless, it could be interesting to know why the authors selected exactly 100 patiens?Next, the study is a prospective, according to the authors. Did they selected all consecutive patients admitted to the hospital, or there were some special criteria. I recommend also to stress the inclusion and exclusion criteria, for example, by making a separate paragraph. Paediatric population, were the children included without restrictions, or it was some selection? Is your hospital operate all paediatric patients with acute abdominal pathology? Who operate the patients? Qualification? The number of operating surgeons? These details are not minor, and they allow to assess the risk of the selection bias. They are also important to increase the reproducibility of the research. Results: Data from the table 3 can be more informative if presented as a bar chart. Tables 2, 5,	

[Review Form2](#)

	and 9 can be removed, as the same information is presented in the text, tables 7 and 8 could be combined in one, information from table 11 can be also given in a simple phrase in the text. Discussion: Good written. The remark is perhaps the authors discuss more about the research on different appendicitis score. Namely, any literature on validation of the Anderson score? It would be interesting to see how the previous research corresponds to the authors findings. There is no Limitation section. I think the authors should add it. Generally, our research attempts are rather limited in the power and validity, so it is necessary to recognise the weaknesses of your study. It will only increase the respect and sympathy for your work. Besides, you can use this section to stress the strength and importance of the study performed.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The paper is scientifically correct and rather robust. The standard methodology approach is followed up in the manuscript. The data is well presented and the conclusions are grounded. It is clear for me that the authors deeply examined the topic and presented the results in a clear, understandable and robust way. I included some minor comments on the statistics used – in a review pane parallel to the text.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are relevant but not recent, there is no citations from the last 5 years. The reference 13 from the year of 1939 has, of course, historical importance, but its clinical significance is rather limited. I think the reference list should be reconsidered.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	There are some omissions, repetitions and other small language issues in the text. The authors need a native English speaker to refine the manuscript.	
Optional/General comments	My comments are placed in the review pane parallel to the text, and I am going to submit the copy of the manuscript with my comments.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sergiy Karachentsev
Department, University & Country	Roan General Hospital, Zambia