Reviewer's report

Title: Emergency open cholecystectomy is associated with markedly lower risk of postoperative nausea and vomiting (PONV) than elective open cholecystectomy: a retrospective cohort study.

Version: 3 Date: 26 October 2009

Reviewer: Daniela Ionescu

Reviewer's report:

Thank you for revising your manuscript.

However only the minor corrections have been done to the initial manuscript. I would suggest to the authors to have a better well established protocol and comparable study groups. It is true they can compare study groups with a different size but the groups in the present study are different in protocol also. Besides, as I have mentioned in my previous report if the final goal is to compare emergency procedure with elective ones is no need to have separate data from all participant hospitals admitting that the protocol was similar. In fact a retrospective study is carrying this risk.

Some examples of major compulsory revisions:
- a very high percentage of NG tube with no description of the criteria for NG tube placement. Modern approach does very rare use NG tubes in both emergency and elective cases.
- no description of the postoperative analgesia protocol: drugs, doses, intervals, VAS and so on. Analgesic protocol must be described for the first 24 h postoperatively and so the incidence of PONV.
- there are differences in premedication use in study groups
- there are differences in time to first oral intake in study groups

Perioperative protocol is not well defined and described.

Criteria for acute cholecystitis are not well defined. There are no indicated reasons for which acute cases have been operated as opened procedures and not evaluated laparoscopically first.

In these conditions it is very difficult to compare the study groups and to draw a pertinent conclusion.

I suggest the authors a prospective study with a well defined protocol and clear end points for evaluation, even if having so many open elective cholecystectomies will take some time.

In the end I would however point out that there is an interesting observation that deserves a rigorous prospective study before advancing a theory on the possible mechanisms.
Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.

Declaration of competing interests:
'I declare that I have no competing interests’