

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

ESPS manuscript NO: 15157

Title: Congenital peritoneal encapsulation

Reviewer's code: 00039422

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2014-11-11 15:01

Date reviewed: 2014-12-14 17:01

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 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 checked="" 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		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This paper is reporting an interesting congenital anomaly. While the report itself is worthwhile, considering the rarity of the case, the English presentation is very poor and must be deeply improved to be suitable for publication. Specifically: The abstract is too long. In the discussion is written that "only 20 to 40 reports in the literature". It is too vague and the authors should be more precise about the number. I would add some more literature in the References. Fig. 1 is not specific and does not add anything to the paper.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

ESPS manuscript NO: 15157

Title: Congenital peritoneal encapsulation

Reviewer's code: 00739711

Reviewer's country: Spain

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2014-11-11 15:01

Date reviewed: 2014-12-12 01:59

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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Doctor, The peritoneal encapsulation is an entity that deserves case by case reports due to its rare presentation. Large series of cases would be probably difficult to subscribe. The present case is well documented with plain X-Ray and intraoperative photos, but needs a major language revision and a more exhausted paper structure to be published. Sincerely, DR. C. GOLFFIER

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

ESPS manuscript NO: 15157

Title: Congenital peritoneal encapsulation

Reviewer's code: 00028194

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2014-11-11 15:01

Date reviewed: 2014-12-18 03:25

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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This manuscript describes a very interesting case, and should be published. However, it should first be edited for English. Some specific points to consider: 1. The authors have a very interesting section of the embryologic origins of the PE. The authors describe what is not normal, but they much compare this with the normal case in order for the ideas to be understandable. For example, "during normal fetal development, the small bowel returns to the abdominal cavity... However, a PE can result when...." 2. Are the authors certain that the PE was responsible for the obstruction? How can they be sure? 3. Arrows or labels in Figure 2 would be extremely helpful. 4. What is an "emergency root" of the peritoneal membrane? Is this a standard term that can be labeled in Figure 2?