

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

ESPS manuscript NO: 25278

Title: Abdominal tuberculosis: Diagnosis and demographics, a 10 year retrospective review from a single centre

Reviewer's code: 00724236

Reviewer's country: Turkey

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2016-03-18 09:05

Date reviewed: 2016-03-22 17:15

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

Dear Author The language of the article is fine but a few questions would better be addressed in this regard.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

ESPS manuscript NO: 25278

Title: Abdominal tuberculosis: Diagnosis and demographics, a 10 year retrospective review from a single centre

Reviewer's code: 02450486

Reviewer's country: Germany

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2016-03-18 09:05

Date reviewed: 2016-03-31 13:36

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" 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 is an interesting case series that is presented in a concise and balanced manner. Novelty is limited, but there is clearly educational value in this paper. Some specific points should be addressed to further improve the work. Specific points: 1) Given that ATB can take many forms the authors should explain better what signs of abdominal involvement were accepted as "presumed" of ATB. E.g., what imaging finding exactly? 2) The representation of data in Figure 2 is suboptimal since it cannot be seen how the "combination of sites" fraction is composed. The authors should find a different representation that shows exactly how common each manifestation was and in addition state how often multiple sites were involved. 3) It should be specified what parameter exactly was measured to evaluate Vitamin D status - likely 25-hydroxy-vitamin D.