



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 75870

Title: Cavernous hemangioma of the ileum in a young man: A case report and review of literature

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05401900

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Iran

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-02-19

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-02-19 16:45

Reviewer performed review: 2022-02-20 06:50

Review time: 14 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



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

Thank you for your submission. Your manuscript was an interesting read. But the manuscript is not well organized and does not follow a clear flow. Please see the following comments about how your data could be further clarified:

- Many of these issues have been published in various journals. The question is what is the novelty of this manuscript compared to previous reports?
- In terms of writing and grammar, there are some flaws, please correct them.
- There is no explanation about the type of CT scan device, the type of contrast drug to perform this CT scan.
- In most cases, in the examination of hemangiomas by CT scan, images are prepared in three phases: non-injection phase, intravenous phase and delayed phase. There is no explanation in this regard. CT scan images should be based on these phases to confirm the presence of hemangiomas.
- There are three CT scan shapes in the shapes section. The difference between these three figures in terms of cross- section and phase- type must be specified.
- The description states that the CT scan was taken by injection, but did not specify whether an oral contrast agent was used.
- The report of CT scan images and histological images with hematoxylin and eosin staining is very brief and insufficient.
- The figure below refers to HE staining Do you mean hematoxylin and eosin staining?



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 75870

Title: Cavernous hemangioma of the ileum in a young man: A case report and review of literature

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06187236

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-02-19

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-02-24 18:48

Reviewer performed review: 2022-02-24 19:45

Review time: 1 Hour

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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input checked="" 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 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

Thank you very much for considering me to review this article. The authors present in interesting case. My overall analysis is that the scientific content is good however the delivery and English proficiency is poor. Hence it is not completely impactful. I would recommend the authors to use professional help in reframing the sentences especially paying attention to the present tensor past tense of the manuscript and being consistent in either present tense or past tense but not mixed in between. I would also recommend the authors to be objective and not use subjective terms to describe findings. I would recommend adding a table of advantages and disadvantages of capsule endoscopy versus DBE to relay the message more clearly. The following are my recommendations: 1. The case summary says patient presented with melena and bloody stool. I would like to point out that it would be appropriate to replace bloody stool with hematochezia for consistency of explanation. Bloody stool is vague. 2. In case summary I suggest to mention the degree of anemia with the number instead of saying " significant anemia" 3. Case summary says 340 cm back, it would be better to say 340 cm proximal to IC valve. 4. The case MD mentions occult GI hemorrhage, however, patient had clear intermittent melena and hematochezia in the first line. I would recommend to eliminate the word "occult" 5. HPI mentions line: Hemodynamic stability maintenance, would recommend the authors to explain what they mean or remove it altogether. 6. Grammatical errors for example blood transfusion therapy and PPI inhibitors were" applied" is incorrect. Please reframe the sentence. The line after that is also grammatically incorrect please refrain. 7.there is no such thing thing as "free" previous medical history-kindly say no past medical history 8. Lab "examination" is



**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

incorrect remove examination and leave it at laboratory. 9. I would recommend the authors to give liver, kidney, coagulation function results. What do you mean by auto antibody spectrum and tumor markers, kindly specify. 10. What are " other" biochemical results. Please be specific 11. The authors mention dark red" fecal" blood. That is inappropriate use of terminology, kindly reframe or remove the word fecal. 12. Please remove the word fecal blood there is no such terminology. It has been use repeatedly 13. The treatment section has been explained in a very confusing manner would recommend to reframe it in a simplified way. 14. Hemangioma is not a " pathogen". Pathogens are usually viruses or bacteria is, kindly reframe. 15. Discussion section mentions that Dalia et al did a colonoscopy during remission. If the disease is in remission then would it not be obvious that there would be no signs of bleeding? Did the authors mean during asymptomatic disease, if that is the case kindly use the appropriate terminology. 16. Authors have mentioned that capsule endoscopy and DBE powerful "weapons". I would recommend to not use such words and be objective during explanation. 17. Treatment portion of the disease has been explained well. 18. Pictures and tables are good.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 75870

Title: Cavernous hemangioma of the ileum in a young man: A case report and review of literature

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03727205

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: FACS, MBBS, MCh, MS

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-02-19

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-02-21 08:56

Reviewer performed review: 2022-02-28 06:40

Review time: 6 Days and 21 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" 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



**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

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

Comments: 1) There are a lot of grammatical errors and spelling mistakes. Thorough language editing is suggested. 2) Providing intra-operative and microscopic images will add value to the manuscript. 3) There are repetitions at many places. I would suggest authors to edit out the redundant contents. 4) Why was surgery delayed for about 1 month? 5) Topic does not go in accordance with the content. Most common presentation of ileal hemangioma is in fact bleeding. What was unusual about it? 6) Mentioning dates in the case report section is not required. Only duration should be mentioned. 7) Hemangioma is not a pathogen, its a pathology/ disease (2nd paragraph, discussion section)



RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 75870

Title: Cavernous hemangioma of the ileum in a young man: A case report and review of literature

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05401900

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Iran

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-02-19

Reviewer chosen by: Ying-Ying Liu (Quit 2022)

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-05-09 07:18

Reviewer performed review: 2022-05-09 09:12

Review time: 1 Hour

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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
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

The authors' reply was well studied and the reviewer's points were matched with the authors' comments and corrections, so the above was somewhat corrected, and this correction is approved by me.