

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Surgical Procedures

ESPS manuscript NO: 14300

Title: Ileo-anal pouch excision: A review of indications and outcomes

Reviewer's code: 00042958

Reviewer's country: Sweden

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2014-09-28 11:46

Date reviewed: 2014-11-08 03:45

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Accept
<input checked="" 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 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		[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 authors have with great effort looked into an important but difficult area. There are a number of papers focusing on rates of failures and reasons to this. Less is however said about those needing excision and their outcome. The only thing I miss is actually a more detailed discussion regarding when to excise the pouch and when to leave it in situ. Some minor language issues, e.g. page 12 line 4 starting with Pouch excision.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Surgical Procedures

ESPS manuscript NO: 14300

Title: Ileo-anal pouch excision: A review of indications and outcomes

Reviewer's code: 02530199

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2014-09-28 11:46

Date reviewed: 2014-10-23 21:01

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	<input checked="" 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"/> 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 is a nice and comprehensive paper on a serious surgical problem. I have no substantial criticisms. Some minor comments. 1.I'd like to see more of the authors point of view. 2.Please add some information on when to excise and when to permanently divert. I.e.: in case of a permanent sinus after diversion, can the pouch be left in place? 3. There is no need of sub-chapters of the pouch excision chapter. At the end of the first part, your statement "Isolated cases may be suitable for a Kock pouch." needs a reference and also a more exhaustive explanation