



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 77020

**Title:** Metal stent combined with ileus drainage tube for the treatment of delayed rectal perforation: A case report

**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:** 2022-04-12

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-04-12 05:25

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-04-12 09:18

**Review time:** 3 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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**

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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 is not well organized and does not follow a clear flow. Please see the following comments about how your data could be further clarified:

- The title of the article is very long and this length makes it difficult to understand the subject.
- The purpose written in the introduction is very long and contains unnecessary content.
- The number of figures presented in this draft is very large, and some of them do not present a specific subject and content, but will confuse the reader more.
- The content presented in the discussion section is very long and tedious, and the content is discussed outside the topic.
- The working mechanism of this tool and method is not explained at all. It is even necessary that the working mechanism of this method or tool be discussed.
- With these descriptions, I did not see any significant novelty in this work.



### PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 77020

**Title:** Metal stent combined with ileus drainage tube for the treatment of delayed rectal perforation: A case report

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05388269

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD, RN

**Professional title:** Assistant Professor, Attending Doctor, Doctor, Nurse, Research Assistant, Staff Physician, Statistician, Surgeon

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

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-04-12

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-04-12 12:23

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-04-22 16:57

**Review time:** 10 Days and 4 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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



<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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**

1. Abstract under CASE SUMMARY: place (LST) after laterally spreading tumor (LST) of the rectum. 2. Abstract under CONCLUSION: Suggest revision to: "For patients with complicated delayed perforation in the lower rectum but have an adequate intestinal preparation, SECMS combined with TIDT can be used and may obtain a very good outcome." 3. Under Core tip: "5 cm away from the anal orifice, and below the peritoneal (reversal)" You meant peritoneal reflection? 4. INTRODUCTION: • Acute iatrogenic colorectal perforation (AICP) is a serious adverse event, but it is rare – Can you enumerate common cause of AICP? • Different presentation if perforation was in Colon vs Rectum / or this is focused on Rectal perforation only? • OTSC (overthe-scope clips) to (over-the-scope clips) • Incidence of Perforation rectal tumor ESD? 5. CASE PRESENTATION: • Physical examination: Role of dexamethasone injection?; Change P 81 times/min to "Pulse rate of 81/min"; 6. What was/were the side effect(s) of a low-rectum SECMS? Was there tenesmus? 7. Considering that the anastomosis was covered by a metallic stent, was not putting a TIDT an option? 8. What are the other options for rectal perforation (aside from endoscopic)?



## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 77020

**Title:** Metal stent combined with ileus drainage tube for the treatment of delayed rectal perforation: A case report

**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:** 2022-04-12

**Reviewer chosen by:** Jia-Ping Yan

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-05-26 02:22

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-05-26 04:14

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Peer-reviewer</b>	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**

Thanks for editing and answering the authors. The cases and points corrected by the authors in the manuscript are not very recognizable. And according to my review, many cases were not corrected. Please highlight the corrected items in the text. Also upload modified shapes. By the way, I do not mean that the title of the article should be written in abbreviated form.