

#### PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 71917

**Title:** Colo-colonic intussusception with post polypectomy electrocoagulation syndrome:

A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05560822 Position: Editorial Board Academic degree: MD

**Professional title:** Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Egypt

Author's Country/Territory: South Korea

Manuscript submission date: 2021-10-07

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-11-09 22:09

Reviewer performed review: 2021-11-19 00:04

**Review time:** 9 Days and 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Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [] 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
Re-review	[ ]Yes [Y]No



# Baishideng **Publishing**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA

**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568 **E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

Peer-reviewer

Peer-Review: [ ] Anonymous [Y] Onymous

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

#### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors present a rare case of colo-colonic intussusception with PPES in a female with no significant previous medical history. Though looking a simple case, it is quite interesting, well prescribed with good language and clear conclusion raising the importance of combining a clinical scenario with a radiological finding to achieve a differential diagnosis and correct management plan.



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 71917

**Title:** Colo-colonic intussusception with post polypectomy electrocoagulation syndrome:

A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05464606 Position: Editorial Board Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Professor, Surgeon, Surgical Oncologist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Taiwan

Author's Country/Territory: South Korea

Manuscript submission date: 2021-10-07

Reviewer chosen by: Xin Liu

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-12-21 15:40

Reviewer performed review: 2021-12-27 08:59

**Review time:** 5 Days and 17 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ <mark>Y</mark> ] 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 [ ] Major revision [ Y] Rejection
Re-review	[ ]Yes [Y]No



Peer-reviewer

# Baishideng **Publishing**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA

**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568 **E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous

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

#### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I have the following comments about this manuscript. 1. Since the patient received the procedure at another hospital, the authors mentioned that they did not know the detailed information about the manipulation. I strongly suggested the authors to acquire the images during the procedure of polypectomy and add detailed information from another hospital. Besides, did you think the swelling change of right side colon wall might be caused by submucosal injection before electrocoagulation and polypectomy? Please add this in you text. 2. Please add your opinion or information from the literature to inform the readers how to prevent this complication and the best strategy to manage it. 3. About the occurrence of intussusception in this case, did you think it may be caused or aggravated by the procedure of "SUCTION" at the end of the procedure to deflate the distended colon. 4. Originality is the first priority in the preparation of manuscript submission. I have checked the plagiarism and the similarity rate is 46%. This is the main cause of rejection.



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 71917

**Title:** Colo-colonic intussusception with post polypectomy electrocoagulation syndrome:

A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03251521 Position: Editorial Board Academic degree: MD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor, Chief Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: South Korea

Manuscript submission date: 2021-10-07

Reviewer chosen by: Xin Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-12-23 16:59

Reviewer performed review: 2022-01-05 15:59

Review time: 12 Days and 22 Hours

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



Peer-reviewer

Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous

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

#### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The case is interesting, but not attractive enough.



#### RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 71917

**Title:** Colo-colonic intussusception with post polypectomy electrocoagulation syndrome:

A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05464606 Position: Editorial Board Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Professor, Surgeon, Surgical Oncologist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Taiwan

Author's Country/Territory: South Korea

Manuscript submission date: 2021-10-07

Reviewer chosen by: Xin-Ran Guo (Quit 2022)

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-01-25 05:48

Reviewer performed review: 2022-01-28 16:17

**Review time:** 3 Days and 10 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ Y] 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
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [ Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous



https://www.wjgnet.com

statements

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

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. The authors have revised the draft point to point as requested. 2. Originality is the priority in consideration of publication. In detecting the issue of Plagiarism with the Turnitin system, I notice the similarity rate is 39% without regard to the references. Please revise the draft as the Turnitin report attached.