

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

ESPS manuscript NO: 17819

Title: Management of afferent loop obstruction: Reoperation or endoscopic and percutaneous interventions?

Reviewer's code: 00004485

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2015-03-26 20:13

Date reviewed: 2015-04-21 23:54

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 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

This manuscript addresses the diagnosis and therapeutic options in patients who develop afferent limb syndrome after respective or bypass therapy. 1. Minor grammar suggestions: a. Imaging studies paragraph 3, line 2 = when a pancreaticoduodenectomy has been done. b. Management, paragraph 1, line 18/19 = in the setting of a prior pancreaticoduodenectomy... c. Management, paragraph 2, line 1/2 = As mentioned above... In contrast, palliative approaches... d. Paragraph 2, line 11 = In the Pannala series... 2. Please add balloon dilation of an afferent limb caused by anastomotic ulcer. This has been well described and is the usual way this is treated in the reviewer's institution in addition to ulcer healing with PPIs. Would add this both to the text and Table 1. 3. In the Management section, the authors discuss treatment of an afferent limb can be accomplished by placing pancreaticobiliary stents if these anastomoses are stenosed after a Whipple. Please clarify that this will work only if the proximal portion of the stent is downstream from the area of afferent limb obstruction.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

ESPS manuscript NO: 17819

Title: Management of afferent loop obstruction: Reoperation or endoscopic and percutaneous interventions?

Reviewer's code: 02445426

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2015-03-26 20:13

Date reviewed: 2015-05-30 22:48

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" 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"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input 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

In general, this is an interesting review paper with unique originality. The article is well-organized and includes useful information on this rare clinical condition. Only suggestion is that the paper needs minor language polishing and should include proper references in discussion.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

ESPS manuscript NO: 17819

Title: Management of afferent loop obstruction: Reoperation or endoscopic and percutaneous interventions?

Reviewer's code: 02445518

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2015-03-26 20:13

Date reviewed: 2015-05-05 16:28

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" 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 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

The invited review Afferent loop obstruction: Reoperation or endoscopic and percutaneous interventions? By Blouhos K, is an interesting good review well organized on a particular and rare complication. Few studies have been written on this item generally presenting case report or small group of patients. Minor suggestion: 4' line from the bottom in abstract, in the, must be removed 1 of the 2 time. The only advice I may suggest, regards the 2 presented tables were is not evident if authors suggestions or literature data, are reported. If indication for management, as I suppose, are suggestion from literature, all reference must be inserted to better identify relative studies.