

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

ESPS manuscript NO: 27162

Title: Increasing trend in retained rectal foreign bodies

Reviewer's code: 02445426

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2016-05-16 17:20

Date reviewed: 2016-05-20 23:08

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 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 checked="" 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	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting case series of rectal foreign bodies. The article is well focused and provides useful clinical information on this field. I have a minor comment. It is surprising that there was no patient who presented with rectal perforation caused by the foreign bodies. I assume that these patients might have been missed from this series. Otherwise, did the authors exclude such patients from this study? In the same context, rectal foreign body is sometimes caused by violent behavior from the others including rape. In such a case, rectal perforation is often observed. Is it possible that the authors add these patients to the series and discuss on the management?

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

ESPS manuscript NO: 27162

Title: Increasing trend in retained rectal foreign bodies

Reviewer's code: 03529813

Reviewer's country: Portugal

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2016-05-16 17:20

Date reviewed: 2016-05-21 07:29

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 type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input checked="" 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	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a small case series of rectal foreign bodies. Although the authors point and discuss some interesting features this is a very small case series. In my opinion the authors should consider to add more cases (I would suggest to review the last 4 years which were not included in this revision).

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

ESPS manuscript NO: 27162

Title: Increasing trend in retained rectal foreign bodies

Reviewer's code: 02445477

Reviewer's country: India

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2016-05-16 17:20

Date reviewed: 2016-05-20 12:05

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 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 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

A sentence about presentation of rectal foreign bodies should be added in introduction. What were the distances from anal verge of location of foreign bodies. I would like to see my images in manuscript.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

ESPS manuscript NO: 27162

Title: Increasing trend in retained rectal foreign bodies

Reviewer's code: 03476334

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2016-05-16 17:20

Date reviewed: 2016-06-09 19:29

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 type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input checked="" 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 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

Thanks for the opportunity to review your observational study describing the trend of rectal foreign bodies. I believe that your finding are very important in a clinical setting. I have several concerns, some of which should be addressed by the authors prior to publication. 1. In the Results, you mentioned that there was no indication for CT scan in any these patients and therefore was not done. What did you think was the indication for conducting CT scan for the patients with rectal foreign bodies? Compared to plain X-ray film, CT scan was more suitable to detect a situation that patients had peritonitis and perforation following rectal foreign bodies. In fact, some of your patients complained anorectal pain and rectal bleeding, which might have been the symptoms associated with peritonitis and perforation. 2. In the Discussion, the sentence that the data from UK clearly showed a rising trend in the presentation of patients with retained rectal foreign bodies seemed to be exaggeration. Because your results were based on a small number of cases only from a single center, resulting in a low generalizability