

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 81184

Title: Functional constipation in children: What physicians should know

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06098344

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Sweden

Author's Country/Territory: Thailand

Manuscript submission date: 2022-10-28

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-10-29 08:00

Reviewer performed review: 2022-10-29 09:22

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous

statements

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a well-written review paper on the large and interesting field of functional constipation in childhood. The pathophysiology and diagnostic criteria are correct and well presented. Different treatment assessments are thoroughly presented (with references). Tables and figures are excellent. My main objection is that I miss very much a conclusion in this review paper. What is the authors' opinion on optimizing treatment for FC? The title is "Functional constipation in children: Optimizing treatment" but in the abstract is stated that "this review will focus on the pathogenesis of FC, as well as its diagnostic criteria and tools and conventional and novel treatment options". If a conclusion could be added at the end of the main manuscript, to summarize the field, the review would be very much improved. Should the title of the manuscript be rephrased? My minor objections are: About abdominal ultrasound (part 4.3.3): There is a need to add references that are more recent, for example: Pop D et al. Rectum sizes: Assessment by ultrasonography in children with functional constipation. Journal of Paediatrics and Child Health 57 (2021) 1244-1249 (doi:10.1111/jpc.15435) Matsumoto D et al. Consensus Document: Diagnosis for Chronic Constipation with Faecal Retention in the Rectum Using Ultrasonography. Diagnostics 2022, 12, 300. (doi.org/10.3390/diagnostics12020300) About education (part 5,1): Other specialized staff (pediatric RN or urotherapeut) could be mentioned as an important complement to physicians to work with the families crating a thorough plan for treatment and follow-up.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 81184

Title: Functional constipation in children: What physicians should know

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06368358

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: Thailand

Manuscript submission date: 2022-10-28

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-11-03 10:56

Reviewer performed review: 2022-11-08 04:37

Review time: 4 Days and 17 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous

statements

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. Matter of whole article must be revised and written with the headings i.e. Background, Objectives, Method of searching, Observations and discussion and Conclusion. However, many narrative reviews were available online without this type of format but it is more reliable for high quality publications. 2. Abstract is poorly written. It must be a nutshell of your article and must contains important outcomes of your review matter with concluded statement. 3. Mention full form of Abbreviation at the first time. Abbreviation without full form is not acceptable at the beginning of the article. 4. Linguistic correction is required. Some sentences are corrected in the word file as examples. 5. Go through all the comments and suggestions highlighted in the word file of manuscript and revised whole article accordingly. 6. In no. 1, definition of functional constipation, the matter is more than the requirement. Many sentences are not relevant. Clear definition of functional constipation in children didn't identified even from these 508 words of literature. One paragraph related to Functional incontinence (FI) were found which are irrelevant with the topic. 7. Algorithms especially for differential diagnosis and treatment (according to various etiology or symptomatology) make this article more valuable. Hence, try to make algorithms if possible. 8. Discussion is missing. However, some matter of point no. 4 and 5 can be considered as discussion. One matter in point no 4, was highlighted in word file as an example. Write this type of matter in discussion portion along with your personal opinion and comments. 9. Limitation and important of this article must have to be discussed in discussion. 10. Assistance of the article for further research should have to be mentioned. 11. Expert comment related to the aim (optimizing treatment for function constipation in children) must be mentioned as conclusion after the discussion of reviewed matter.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 81184

Title: Functional constipation in children: What physicians should know

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02936529

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: FRCS (Hon), MD, PhD

Professional title: Professor, Surgical Oncologist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Brazil

Author's Country/Territory: Thailand

Manuscript submission date: 2022-10-28

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-10-30 13:27

Reviewer performed review: 2022-11-08 18:34

Review time: 9 Days and 5 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

statements

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This review regarding functional constipation is of extreme importance for guiding clinicians in decision making, this prevalent dysfunction can be challenging and demands special efforts for assertive treatment. The review is updated and the discussion is convide. Congratulations for the authors.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 81184

Title: Functional constipation in children: What physicians should know

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06368358

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: Thailand

Manuscript submission date: 2022-10-28

Reviewer chosen by: Jing-Jie Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-12-23 06:26

Reviewer performed review: 2022-12-24 09:33

Review time: 1 Day and 3 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Whole article is written under the heading of Introduction. This is not fair for good publication. Introduction should be written first which must be separated from the main contents and it should highlight or introduce the background of the topic and main objectives of the review. All others are ok.