

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Medicine and Health |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJMAH_121291 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Current Management of Gallstone Pancreatitis: Narrative Review |
| Type of the Article | Review Article |

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

| Compulsory REVISION comments | Reviewer's comment | Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i> |
|--|---------------------------|--|
| Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. | | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | | |
| 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. | | |
| Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? | | |
| 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. | | |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. | | |

Review Form 3

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | <p>Peer Review of "Current Management of Gallstone Pancreatitis: Narrative Review"</p> <p>The article "Current Management of Gallstone Pancreatitis: Narrative Review" provides a comprehensive review of the management strategies for acute gallstone pancreatitis. The review examines diagnostic approaches, endoscopic management, timing of cholecystectomy, and the use of imaging techniques like endoscopic ultrasound and MRCP. It also evaluates various studies and guidelines related to these management strategies.</p> <p>Strengths</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Comprehensive Coverage: The review covers a broad range of topics related to gallstone pancreatitis, including diagnostic criteria, management strategies, and timing of interventions. It effectively integrates various perspectives on endoscopic and surgical management. Current References: The article references up-to-date and relevant studies, including systematic reviews and randomized control trials, which enhances its credibility. Clear Structure: The review is well-structured, with distinct sections for endoscopic management, cholecystectomy, and imaging modalities. Tables and a flowchart provide visual summaries of key points. Practical Insights: The article provides practical recommendations on the timing of ERCP and cholecystectomy based on the severity of the pancreatitis, which can be useful for clinicians in practice. <p>Areas for Improvement</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Abstract: The abstract is brief but could benefit from a more detailed summary of the findings and conclusions. Specifically, it should highlight key recommendations on timing and management strategies more explicitly. Introduction: While the introduction provides a good overview of the prevalence and etiology of gallstone pancreatitis, it lacks a detailed description of the specific challenges and controversies in the management of this condition. Adding a few sentences on the current debate or gaps in knowledge could provide more context. Discussion of Evidence: The review presents a range of studies but could improve by more critically evaluating the quality and limitations of these studies. For instance, the review should assess the heterogeneity of study populations and methodologies more thoroughly. Moreover it has not told about the way in which the studies were excluded from review. It needs to tell about the number of articles selected for study. Consistency and Clarity: Some sections, particularly in the discussion of ERCP timing, could benefit from clearer distinctions between different recommendations and guidelines. The review should be more explicit about when and why certain recommendations are preferred based on evidence. Conclusion: The conclusion reiterates many points discussed earlier but could be more concise. It should emphasize the most critical findings and their implications for clinical practice more sharply. References and Citations: Ensure that all references are current and accurately reflect the content discussed. Some citations appear incomplete (e.g., Liu JK et al.) and should be finalized. Additionally, ensure consistency in referencing style throughout the manuscript. Tables and Figures: While the tables are informative, the review could benefit from additional | |

Review Form 3

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>tables or figures summarizing comparative effectiveness or highlighting gaps in the evidence base. The tables include only two studies in one table. It needs to analyze at least a significant few literature work done already</p> <p>8. Language and Grammar: The language is generally clear, but minor grammatical errors and inconsistencies should be addressed. For instance, "an endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography (ERCP)" should be corrected to "endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography (ERCP)" as the article is referring to the procedure generically.</p> <p>Recommendations</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Expand Abstract: Include more detailed information about the main findings and recommendations. 2. Enhance Introduction: Provide more context on the challenges and controversies in managing gallstone pancreatitis. 3. Critically Analyze Evidence: Offer a more in-depth critique of the studies cited, including potential biases and limitations. 4. Clarify Recommendations: Distinguish between different management strategies and guidelines more clearly in the discussion. 5. Streamline Conclusion: Focus on the most important takeaways and implications for clinical practice. 6. Complete References: Ensure all references are complete and consistent. 7. Improve Visual Aids: Consider adding more tables or figures to summarize key findings. 8. Proofread: Address any grammatical errors and ensure consistency in terminology and style. <p>Overall, the article provides a valuable review of gallstone pancreatitis management but would benefit from enhancements in critical analysis, clarity, and presentation to further its utility and impact in the field.</p> | |
|--|--|--|

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? | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Name: | Anandi Andappan |
| Department, University & Country | Stanley Medical College, India |