

## Reviewer's report

**Title:** The Value of Routine Histopathological Examination of Appendicectomy Specimens

**Version:** 1 **Date:** 21 December 2006

**Reviewer:** Donna A Caniano

### Reviewer's report:

General

-----  
Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

-----  
Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

1. Figure 1 is listed twice, once in the Results section as Table 1, and repeated as a separate Figure 1.
2. The author's conclude that the histopathological findings in 13 patients (1.06%) changed clinical management. However, there were abnormal findings in 46 patients, and in most, if not all cases, further evaluation or medical treatment was instituted. For example, the 11 patients with parasitic disease were given medication and the 3 patients with endometriosis were most likely evaluated for additional involvement. This reviewer would contend that all of the abnormal findings, exclusive of appendicitis, were relevant to subsequent patient care.
3. This study has a high incidence of false positive appendicitis (23%). In the era of preoperative CT scanning or ultrasonography for patients with suspected appendicitis, this rate is probably too high. How many of the patients had preoperative imaging, either a CT scan or ultrasound? In many centers in the USA imaging studies have an accuracy of between 94% (for children) and up to 99% (in adults) for diagnosing appendicitis, as well as indicating other pathology. The authors should comment on this, in light of their findings.

-----  
Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

**What next?:** Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

### Declaration of competing interests:

I declare that I have no competing interests.  
DA Caniano, MD