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Comment on the manuscript BSUR-D-17-00262 by Lu, et al.

Cholecystectomy is recommended as the first-line treatment for gall-stone, and percutaneous cholecystostomy is an alternative one in patients with poor risks for complications. The authors compared these two treatments on the hospital stay, costs, mortality and so on by nation-wide study containing 236,742 patients. Although the data is reliable owing to the large number of patients, unfortunately, it is hard to understand the aim authors focused on.

There are several questions and suggestions for corrections.

1) PC and CCS are essentially different treatments; PC is a palliative treatment for acute cholecystitis, while CCS is radical for gall stone. Therefore, it is meaningless to compare these methods.

2) The article is too redundant and complex, and is hard to read.

3) Finally, what is the purpose of this study?

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess
Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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