

## ESPS Peer-review Report

**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 7616

**Title:** Solitary Peutz-Jeghers-type appendiceal hamartomatous polyp growing into the terminal ileum

**Reviewer code:** 02465551

**Science editor:** Wen, Ling-Ling

**Date sent for review:** 2013-11-27 18:50

**Date reviewed:** 2013-11-28 14:31

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	language polishing	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The grammar is ok but the expression is confusing. I had another view on the true underlying pathology. From what I understand, it should be a polyp from the terminal ileum but somehow the appendix invaginated into the polyp from the terminal ileum serosal surface because the pathology report showed the appendix penetrated into the polyp. Is the appendix intussuscepted/ invaginated to the terminal ileum? Can the pathology identified the origin of the polyp? It is strange to write 'oral water' in a medical journal. Anyway it is an interesting report.

## ESPS Peer-review Report

**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 7616

**Title:** Solitary Peutz-Jeghers-type appendiceal hamartomatous polyp growing into the terminal ileum

**Reviewer code:** 02438173

**Science editor:** Wen, Ling-Ling

**Date sent for review:** 2013-11-27 18:50

**Date reviewed:** 2013-12-02 15:22

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	language polishing	BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I think the importance and significance of this case report is the unusual location and presentation of this kind of polyp. However, the manuscript needs to be corrected partially. My comments are: 1. Since this is a case report, I think a representative film of abdominal CT study is necessary! 2.(P.5) The English of this paragraph needs to be polished completely ("Oral water....."). 3.(P.7) In the 2nd paragraph: Since your title is "Appendiceal hamartomatous polyp", you are supposed not to use the words such as "it is \*unclear\* whether the origin of the polyp...." and "the primary lesion ...was \*most likely\* the appendix". You should use the words more definitely by your pathological findings! 4.(P.7) In the 3rd paragraph (Appendiceal tumors are rare....): You may delete the last portion of this paragraph. You don't have to describe the two cases reported by others so clearly. 5.(P.8) The 3rd paragraph (Preventive appendectomy...): The English needs to be corrected from the sentence "The final histopathological results..." to the last one. 6.(P.8) I think you need to perform endoscopic surveillance to see if there is any polyp in the other portions of the GI tract of this patient. 7.(P.9) The last paragraph of discussion: The English needs to be corrected from "We recommend that histologic...". Since the pathological study is necessary for every surgical specimen, you don't need to recommend. Please try other words to have a better expression!

## ESPS Peer-review Report

**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 7616

**Title:** Solitary Peutz-Jeghers-type appendiceal hamartomatous polyp growing into the terminal ileum

**Reviewer code:** 01441415

**Science editor:** Wen, Ling-Ling

**Date sent for review:** 2013-11-27 18:50

**Date reviewed:** 2013-12-08 16:12

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	language polishing	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The priority of this paper is just the rarity of the disease and the type of growth. However, it has a certain level of attraction and impact for physician. This paper contains several typos and errors of usages of references. It is strongly recommended to revise. (1) esophagogastroduodenostomy should be esophagogastroduodenoscopy (2) The ref.4 is put on inappropriately and should be on the end of the sentence. Make sure all refs. (3) Miyhara should be Miyahara (4) The last 3 sentences "We recommend..." are recommended to delete, because first two are unnecessary to mention and I can not understand what the word "difficult" means in the last.

## ESPS Peer-review Report

**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 7616

**Title:** Solitary Peutz-Jeghers-type appendiceal hamartomatous polyp growing into the terminal ileum

**Reviewer code:** 02536876

**Science editor:** Wen, Ling-Ling

**Date sent for review:** 2013-11-27 18:50

**Date reviewed:** 2013-12-09 14:16

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existed	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Grammar is good state. But the pathologic report is to identify the appendiceal lumen penetrating the ileal polyp under microscopy, and then is this polyp origin in the ileum? I want more exactly report.