

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 7404

Title: Deep endometriosis with pericolic lymph node involvement: case report and literature review

Reviewer code: 00667416

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2013-11-16 14:35

Date reviewed: 2013-11-16 17:28

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a well documented and well written paper of potential interest for the readers of the journal

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 7404

Title: Deep endometriosis with pericolic lymph node involvement: case report and literature review

Reviewer code: 02510166

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2013-11-16 14:35

Date reviewed: 2013-11-18 02:40

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	BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript is well written. The topic is of interest. However, I have several concerns. Major concerns: ----- 1) Description of the case presents no follow-up. The patient was operated in May 2012. We are now at more than 1 year since. The report should provide information on her current status. 2) In 2004, the patient presented with "fourth stage (severe) endometriosis". What is meant by "severe" should be clarified. Mettler and Semm stage IV implies that the patient presented with endometrial implants outside the lower pelvis in the intestines, anterior abdominal wall, etc. 3) Despite the 2004's stage presentation, the patient appeared to remain symptom free until late 2011. Clarify whether she received medical treatment or not. 4) The report's conclusion argues for extensive surgery. This is not borne by the case report. The patient's actual condition was caused by bowel infiltration, not by the presence of lymph nodes. The conclusion should be more balanced. Take into consideration whether the literature supports or not extensive surgery. Refer for example to the series of Acien et al in "Is a bowel resection necessary for deep endometriosis with rectovaginal or colorectal involvement?", to randomized clinical trial comparing surgery and hormone (Alkatout et al), or pharmacological management (Streuli et al's review). To this reviewer, the report is valuable to draw attention that lymph node involvement is an issue that warrants further investigation. The report should not overreach beyond that. Minor concerns: ----- There are several typographic errors. The manuscript should be spell-checked : involvment, Autorship, vescical, disfunction (common misspelling of dysfunction!), Progetseron, etc.