

## ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 11722

**Title:** Giant colonic diverticulum: Clinical presentation, diagnosis, and treatment.

Systematic review of 166 cases

**Reviewer code:** 00503612

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2014-06-02 23:27

**Date reviewed:** 2014-06-04 08:20

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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you so much for allowing me to review this case report and review of the literature on giant colonic diverticulum. A few comments/questions: 1. Please re-read and revise your manuscript regarding language and spelling. A simple spell check can resolve many of the issues that you have, but there are far too many that are distracting and take away from the manuscript itself. 2. What doesn't come out well is why is this needed. What is novel or learned from the review of the literature that is not in the current case reports and review but for an additional case and updated ROL? 3. You state that the reason to resect these are to avoid perforation. In the results you state that perforation is the most common complication, but you don't say how often this occurs and it is not in any of the tables either (only pain, or fever or tenderness). Also, is this a complication of not doing this or of the treatment? Finally, was this an acute presentation and how many of these were perforated that someone was aware of their existence (i.e. they chose to watch them and not do anything) versus they had no idea they were present and the perforation was the first indication of them?

## ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 11722

**Title:** Giant colonic diverticulum: Clinical presentation, diagnosis, and treatment.  
Systematic review of 166 cases

**Reviewer code:** 02823396

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2014-06-02 23:27

**Date reviewed:** 2014-06-04 19:34

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I have revised the manuscript entitled "Giant colonic diverticulum: clinical presentation, diagnosis and treatment: Systematic review of 166 cases". In my opinion it is an excellent revision of a rare disease, so should be accepted for publication

## ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 11722

**Title:** Giant colonic diverticulum: Clinical presentation, diagnosis, and treatment.  
Systematic review of 166 cases

**Reviewer code:** 00071779

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2014-06-02 23:27

**Date reviewed:** 2014-06-05 17:23

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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<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"/> No records	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

A good attempt, but adds nothing new to the literature.

## ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 11722

**Title:** Giant colonic diverticulum: Clinical presentation, diagnosis, and treatment.

Systematic review of 166 cases

**Reviewer code:** 00055308

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2014-06-02 23:27

**Date reviewed:** 2014-06-16 21:18

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"/> Existing	<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		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This manuscript describes a case of a 80 year old lady presenting with rectal bleeding in whom a giant diverticulum of the sigmoid colon was diagnosed and surgically treated. Also a review of this rare variant of colonic diverticular disease is reported. It is a useful overview of this pathological condition, its clinical manifestations and treatment options. The main limitation of the study is a poor editing and use of English. I suggest to have a mother tongue professional polishing the manuscript. Examples are: less than 200 studies (papers?) English-language literature English literature diarrhea(11%) diarrhea (11%). contamination.Surgical contamination. Surgical References: names and/or titles partly underlined ?? etc. etc.

## ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 11722

**Title:** Giant colonic diverticulum: Clinical presentation, diagnosis, and treatment.  
Systematic review of 166 cases

**Reviewer code:** 02945445

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2014-06-02 23:27

**Date reviewed:** 2014-06-17 04:17

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"/> Existing	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

A good review of a rare clinical entity. There are a few minor things to clarify: 1) there are a few spell check errors, including spaces between words. 2) What is the proposed etiology of type 3? The authors list a theory for types 1 and 2, but not for 3. 3) State the procedures performed in the other 20% of cases not specifically listed in the treatment heading, or refer the reader to table 3. 4) What (if any) are the long term results? What is the risk of recurrence.