



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 72191

Title: Vaginal enterocele after cystectomy: A case report and review of literature

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer’s code: 04105454

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer’s Country/Territory: Egypt

Author’s Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-10-08

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-10-16 06:54

Reviewer performed review: 2021-10-16 07:06

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

it is well written case report but you repeat the same phrases in abstract as case report so omit the repetition why you did not put mesh to enforce pelvic floor you must clear it try to be short and to the point well done thank you



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 72191

Title: Vaginal enterocele after cystectomy: A case report and review of literature

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05455405

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Surgeon, Surgical Oncologist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Russia

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-10-08

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-10-15 08:37

Reviewer performed review: 2021-10-20 12:52

Review time: 5 Days and 4 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The clinical case described by the authors is of scientific and practical interest, due to the rarity of the disease that caused the request for medical help. The authors also give recommendations on preventive measures that undoubtedly deserve attention. 1 Title. The title fully reflects the content of the manuscript. 2 Abstract. The text is written clearly, reveals the content of the work, the volume of the abstract is sufficient to draw attention to this article. 3 Key words. Key words reflect the focus of the manuscript. 4 Background. The manuscript adequately describes the background, present status and significance of the clinical case. 5 Methods. The therapeutic and diagnostic algorithm used by the authors is beyond doubt. A positive clinical effect has been achieved, data on the long-term period are presented. 6 Results. The achieved result is clear and correctly described. 7 Discussion. The manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically. The discussion is accurate and it discuss the paper's scientific significance and relevance to clinical practice sufficiently. The text of the discussion and conclusion is logical, since the significance of the given clinical case for practical medicine is correctly described. 8 Illustrations and tables. The figures, diagrams and tables are sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents. The table data needs to be checked again and the text corrected, because is defined several times "YSE" instead of YES. 9 Biostatistics. It was not required for this type of scientific work. 10 Units. The authors used of SI units. 11 References. In the manuscript were cited appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections. There is no self-citation. 12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. The manuscript was written at a fairly high level. 13 Research methods and reporting.



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to CARE Checklist (2016) - Case report, the text of CARE Checklist was used and meets these requirements. 14 Ethics statements. Ethical requirements are met.