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|  | 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | Diagnosis of appendicitis is a challenging task in patient presenting with abdominal pain. Researchers are still far from establishing a pathognomonic parameter available as a sole indicator of appendicitis amongst patients presenting with acute abdomen. Since complicated appendicitis is still at high rates, this is a useful article to be aware of this and keep it in mind in the differential diagnosis. |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | Yes, it is suitable. |  |
| 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. | * Sentences "The definition of complicated appendicitis has been an area of concern due to the absence of any universal consensus " and "The diagnosis of complicated appendicitis is another area where there is no consensus and there is no one investigation that can diagnose this condition " can be combined or one can be changed/deleted. * “blood investigations” could be replaced by “serum biomarkers” or “laboratory parameters”. |  |
| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.** | * “The incidence of complicated appendicitis varies between 10% to 30% and it is seen in pediatric and elderly patients.” should be corrected. (Kariya, B.; Krutsri, C.; Singhatas, P.; Sumritpradit, P.; Thampongsa, T.; Lertsitthichai, P.; Phoprom, N. Incidence of complicated appendicitis during the COVID-19 pandemic: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int. J. Surg. Open* 2022, *45*, 100512.) * “The incidence of complicated appendicitis is related to factors like increasing age, and the presence of co-morbidities like diabetes mellitus, chronic anemia, and hypertension.” More details could be written about complicated appendicitis risk factors. (Naderan M, Babaki AE, Shoar S, Mahmoodzadeh H, Nasiri S, Khorgami Z. Risk factors for the development of complicated appendicitis in adults. Ulus Cerrahi Derg. 2016 Mar 1;32(1):37-42. doi: 10.5152/UCD.2015.3031.) |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.**  **-** | It is pleasing that studies conducted in the last five years are mostly preferred as references.   * Bilgili YD, Uçarcı DT, Güvenç BH (2024) Diagnostic parameters for acute appendicitis in pediatric patients with abdominal pain: An analytical interpretation. Ann Clin Anal Med 15(4):228-233. |  |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | Understandable language has been used, but it would be better to edit it to correct grammatical errors before printing. |  |
| Optional/General comments | -The importance of physical examination should be mentioned. Important points in the examination should be written as a separate paragraph before biomarkers. Although various algorithms have been developed, physical examination will always maintain its importance in the diagnosis of appendicitis.  -“Imaging in the form of ultrasound of the abdomen and computerized tomography are often used to confirm the diagnosis of complicated appendicitis(18).” please remove this sentence in biomarkers section.  - There are articles stating that the algorithms are used to exclude the diagnosis, not to differentiate acute appendicitis from perforated appendicitis.  Samuel M. Pediatric appendicitis score. Journal of Pediatric Surgery 2002;37(6): 877-881.  “*the use of appendicitis scores alone is still not recommended for diagnosing appendicitis in children. At least, the scores may be an additional diagnostic tool to decrease unnecessary imaging and radiation exposure.” Dingemann J, Ure B. Imaging and the use of scores for the diagnosis of appendicitis in children. Eur J Pediatr Surg. 2012 Jun;22(3):195-200. doi: 10.1055/s-0032-1320017. Epub 2012 Jul 5. PMID: 22767172*  “*Such algorithms are user dependent and rely on subjective data calculated by the provider. parameters when combined with clinical history and detailed physical examination, significantly increase discrimination in differential diagnosis.”*  *Bilgili YD, Uçarcı DT, Güvenç BH (2024) Diagnostic parameters for acute appendicitis in pediatric patients with abdominal pain: An analytical interpretation. Ann Clin Anal Med 15(4):228-233.*  - The third paragraph in the Imaging Methods section should state that CT involves radiation.  - Care should be taken not to start sentences with numbers.  For example:  “23 studies with 4427 patients were included of which 1173 were complicated appendicitis.”  “13 studies with 1892 patients of which 620 had complicated appendicitis.”  - The arrangement of abbreviations in the text should be reviewed. Although Magnetic resonance Imaging (MRI) was written before, no abbreviations were used in the last paragraph of the image section. There is a similar situation in CT.  - US and MRI values ​​should also be added to Table 2.  - MRI can be suggested instead of CT in sentence "Patients with complicated appendicitis should undergo imaging modalities like computerized tomography as this can aid in planning the management" (conclusion). Currently, CT is not recommended, especially in children, because it contains radiation. |  |
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