



# BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 28692

**Title:** Limited, local, extracolonic spread of mucinous appendiceal adenocarcinoma after perforation with formation of a malignant appendix-to-sigmoid fistula:

**Reviewer's code:** 02440510

**Reviewer's country:** Bosnia and Herzegovina

**Science editor:** Yuan Qi

**Date sent for review:** 2016-07-13 16:21

**Date reviewed:** 2016-07-23 17:48

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> 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 type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		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

This is an interesting presentation of a Case report with literature review in which is evaluated limited, local, extracolonic spread of mucinous appendiceal adenocarcinoma after perforation with formation of a malignant appendix-to-sigmoid fistula. The main limitation of this article is the fact that this is presentation of Case report which has generally limited scientific impact. However, the authors treated a very important topic, the manuscript is well organized and written and all limitations are mentioned in the manuscript.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 28692

**Title:** Limited, local, extracolonic spread of mucinous appendiceal adenocarcinoma after perforation with formation of a malignant appendix-to-sigmoid fistula:

**Reviewer's code:** 03035498

**Reviewer's country:** Morocco

**Science editor:** Yuan Qi

**Date sent for review:** 2016-07-13 16:21

**Date reviewed:** 2016-08-11 17:27

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 checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		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

Dear author This an unusual and interesting case that nicely written. There are some minors changes that should be made: - Abstract, page 4: "The primary tumor was surgically debulked": please state the exact surgical procedure performed. "The patient did well during...with no clinically evident...": please ad radiological also for more clarity. "This case dramatically illustrates...": please remove "dramatically". - Core tip, page 4: "The patient presented with RLQ...": please expand RLQ. - Case report, page 6: "The abdominal mass was resected". Please state the exact surgical procedure performed (example: enbloc right colectomy with sigmoid resection...). "the patient developed postoperative ileus from which he slowly recovered": please remove slowly or explain exactly when the ileus disappeared. Please remove "while tolerating normal diet": it is obvious that a patient would tolerate normal diet if he recovered. Discussion, page 7: "no cases of distant lymphatic...": for clarity, please modify the sentence: "No cases of distant lymphatic or hematogeneous metastases were reported by "author et al." ..." The same for "ovarian involvement..." Page 8: please remove dramatically. Comments, page 10: expang RLQ. Page 11,



## BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

---

treatment section: state the exact surgical procedure



# BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 28692

**Title:** Limited, local, extracolonic spread of mucinous appendiceal adenocarcinoma after perforation with formation of a malignant appendix-to-sigmoid fistula:

**Reviewer's code:** 03358825

**Reviewer's country:** Canada

**Science editor:** Yuan Qi

**Date sent for review:** 2016-07-13 16:21

**Date reviewed:** 2016-08-13 01:10

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 checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		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

This is a well written case report with interesting conclusions Few comments 1. Abstract, introduction and core tip looks very similar in content and language. Slight modification to differentiate their purpose is recommended. Case details need not described in the introduction 2. The authors describe in the "Methods" about review of literature. But I do not see further information on that like what are the case reports included, how many perforated, different management approaches undertaken etc. 3. Significant discrepancy between imaging showing only fistula and the intraop showing significant local invasion with involvement of abdominal wall and bladder. Also histopath did not reveal any adjacent visceral involvement?