

### PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 70970

Title: Using a fretsaw in treating chronic penial incarceration: a case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05637853 Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: BSc, MPhil, MSc

Professional title: Academic Research, Research Assistant, Research Scientist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Pakistan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-08-21

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-09-04 07:41

Reviewer performed review: 2021-09-16 23:31

**Review time:** 12 Days and 15 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous



https://www.wjgnet.com

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

#### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Manuscript No.: 70970 Title: Using a fretsaw in treating chronic penial incarceration with metallic hoop: a case report and literature review In this study, the author has studied "Using a fretsaw in treating chronic penial incarceration with metallic hoop: a case report and literature review." The topic is interesting, but the English language used in the manuscript needs major improvements as there are some punctuation and grammatical mistakes present throughout the manuscript. The figures required the proper explanation and caption. Moreover, research models are not discussed in an understandable manner; the introduction section is poor followed by literature, which reflects that the author needs a more comprehensive way of thinking. The discussion part is not up to the mark, and no significant comparison is made. Most of the references are from low impact journals. It is obvious that the quality of the manuscript does not fulfil the standards of the journal; therefore, it should be reconsidered after major revision. Specific comments: 1. The authors are advised to revise the title to make clear whether it is a case report or review. 2. The authors are advised to revise the abstract especially the conclusion section. 3. Please add more strong keywords up to six. 4. Page 3, line 72-78: "Penial incarceration is a rare situation, usually with foreign objects strangulated." Please add a reference here. 5. Page 3, The whole introduction section is general. Authors are advised to revise the introduction section carefully and add more data to make an association between each sentence to support the problem statement. It is recommended to add literature in the introduction section to create a research gap. 6. Page 3: What is the novelty of the present study? 7. Page 4, line 106-107: "This steel hoop was 40mm in the external diameter, with a 10 mm width and a 2mm thickness." There is always a space between a value and a unit (40 mm). 8. The authors are advised to



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568

**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

move the literature from the discussion to the introduction section for better understanding. 9. The discussion section is not up to the mark; the authors only discussed general literature without any comparison of results. The discussion should be in form of paragraphs instead of sections. No limitations are enlisted, and no overall conclusion is added. Overall, the discussion section needs extensive revision. 10. Authors are advised to proofread the whole manuscript to overcome grammatical mistakes. 11. The figures need proper interpretation and appropriate captions, and proper labelling. 12. The figure legends always should be below the figure. 13. Please revise the references according to the journal instructions.



### PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 70970

Title: Using a fretsaw in treating chronic penial incarceration: a case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05387164 Position: Editorial Board Academic degree: MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-08-21

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-09-24 01:21

Reviewer performed review: 2021-09-24 02:33

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [ Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous



https://www.wjgnet.com

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear authors Thank you for your manuscript submission to our journal. Your operative technique itself is similar to using a thread to remove a ring from the finger. This condition, however, is rarely encountered. Your report, therefore, is very informative to the readers. Minor mistakes I noticed are as follows; P7 line 5; Various tools were mention in line 25; Campbell's reported P8 line 13; Urgent situation vesus. Chronic Situation



# RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 70970

**Title:** Using a fretsaw in treating chronic penial incarceration: a case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05637853 Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: BSc, MPhil, MSc

Professional title: Academic Research, Research Assistant, Research Scientist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Pakistan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-08-21

Reviewer chosen by: Ji-Long Wang (Online Science Editor)

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-11-24 11:48

Reviewer performed review: 2021-11-25 05:30

**Review time:** 17 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [ Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous



statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

# SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors made point by point response. So, it should be accepted in the present form.