



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

ESPS manuscript NO: 24163

Title: Three-dimensional endoanal ultrasound for diagnosis of perianal fistulas: Reliable and objective technique

Reviewer's code: 03253021

Reviewer's country: Spain

Science editor: Jing Yu

Date sent for review: 2016-01-29 10:20

Date reviewed: 2016-02-10 02:59

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In my opinion this manuscript provides an interesting piece of information, treated with great honesty by someone with great experience in the field. 1. References are a bit outdated. 2. References 17, 20, 23 and 24 are repeated 3. Methods are not clearly exposed in the abstract. 4. Could the differences observed have any impact in the choice of the surgical technique? In other words, can the increases increase of the accuracy benefice this patients?. 5. A comment about the automated computer analysis of the 3D images could be interesting



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

ESPS manuscript NO: 24163

Title: Three-dimensional endoanal ultrasound for diagnosis of perianal fistulas: Reliable and objective technique

Reviewer's code: 03529793

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Jing Yu

Date sent for review: 2016-01-29 10:20

Date reviewed: 2016-03-01 02:02

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

the paper offers an interesting comparison of the diagnostic yield of 2D-EAUS vs 3D-EAUS for perianal fistulas. The gold standard in the present study are intraoperative findings, although other groups think that MRI can demonstrate perianal fistulas missed by the surgeon. Unfortunately a comparison with MRI is not available, nor a post-surgical follow-up. The Authors are aware of these and other limitations and this is discussed.