

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 64273

Title: Inverted Meckel's diverticulum diagnosed using capsule endoscopy.

Reviewer's code: 05901772 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Spain

Author's Country/Territory: Spain

Manuscript submission date: 2021-03-23

Reviewer chosen by: Ya-Juan Ma

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-03-29 11:07

Reviewer performed review: 2021-03-29 19:17

Review time: 8 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[] Grade A: Priority publishing [] Grade B: Minor language polishing [Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

of Nice atypical with Strong points: presentation an entity, endoscopic-radiologic-hystopathologic correlation in the final diagnosis. The manuscript reinforces the capsule endoscopy role in this rare condition. Limitations: very rare condition with anecdotic references in the literature. Poor english redaction, please check out. Mix-up of inverted and non-inverted Meckel's diverticulum definition when describing endoscopic findings (please see results section and figures caption). Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? YES 2 Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? YES 3 Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? YES 4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? YES 5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? YES 6 Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study? What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field? When describing capsule endoscopy findings, it needs to be clarified that these findings may suggest an INVERTED Meckel's diverticulum, since these are not the typical features of a non-inverted Meckel's d. In capsule findings description, I would avoid the term tumor and use terms like bulge/protuberance/protrusion or lifted erosion/ulcer. 7 Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically? Are the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner? Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper's scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently? Correlation between endoscopic findings, histopathology and radiology is a strong point. A definition proposal or suspicion signs of inverted Meckel's diverticulum via capsule endoscopy would be of added value for



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA

Telephone: +1-925-399-1568 **E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

relevance of the manuscript in clinical practice. Or at least clarify that the main arguments for diagnosis, also in this presentation, is its clinical suspicion. Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents? Do figures require labeling with arrows, asterisks etc., better legends? It also needs to be clarified that the capsule endoscopy images correspond to an INVERTED Meckel's d. 9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? NA 10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? YES 11 References. Does the manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections? YES Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references? NO 12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate? Poor English redaction. Please check 13 Research methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to manuscript type and the appropriate categories, as follows: (1) CARE Checklist (2013) - Case report; (2) CONSORT 2010 Statement - Clinical Trials study, Prospective study, Randomized Controlled trial, Randomized Clinical trial; (3) PRISMA 2009 Checklist - Evidence-Based Medicine, Systematic review, Meta-Analysis; (4) STROBE Statement - Case Control study, Observational study, Retrospective Cohort study; and (5) The ARRIVE Guidelines - Basic study. Did the author prepare the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting? YES 14 Ethics statements. For all manuscripts involving human studies and/or animal experiments, author(s) must submit the related formal ethics documents that were reviewed and approved by their local ethical review committee. Did the manuscript meet the requirements of ethics? YES



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 64273

Title: Inverted Meckel's diverticulum diagnosed using capsule endoscopy.

Reviewer's code: 00047316 Position: Editorial Board Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Hungary

Author's Country/Territory: Spain

Manuscript submission date: 2021-03-23

Reviewer chosen by: Ya-Juan Ma

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-03-29 14:59

Reviewer performed review: 2021-03-31 14:10

Review time: 1 Day and 23 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No



SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Excellent case report indicating the value of small bowel capsule endoscopy (CE) in iron deficiency anaemia of unknown origin. The new information is that - inverted Meckel's diverticula (IMD) may have a tumor like appearance on CE records - IMD may have the absence of gastric or pancreatic heterotopic histology - the role of CE in identification of Meckel's diverticulum is not yet clear. The paper is will written and only one question may arise: What was size in mm of the protruding lesion detected by CE?



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 64273

Title: Inverted Meckel's diverticulum diagnosed using capsule endoscopy.

Reviewer's code: 03668600 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: MD, MSc

Professional title: Professor, Staff Physician

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Brazil

Author's Country/Territory: Spain

Manuscript submission date: 2021-03-23

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-03-24 12:20

Reviewer performed review: 2021-04-06 17:08

Review time: 13 Days and 4 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No



SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Very interesting case. However there are several grammar details that should be improved.