

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

Manuscript NO: 90926

Title: Endoscopic ultrasound-guided lauromacrogol injection for treatment of colorectal

cavernous hemangioma: Case report and literature review

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03727100 Position: Editorial Board Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor, Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-12-19

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-12-19 23:40

Reviewer performed review: 2023-12-24 12:59

Review time: 4 Days and 13 Hours

	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C:
Scientific quality	Good
	[] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No creativity or innovation



Scientific significance of the	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair
conclusion in this manuscript	[] Grade D: No scientific significance
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) [] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[]Yes [Y]No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

For editors and authors, Thank you for giving me the opportunity to review the interesting manuscript entitled "Endoscopic ultrasound-guided lauromacrogol injection for treatment of colorectal cavernous hemangioma: Case report and literature review". I have some opinions for this manuscript. I hope this helps. 1. The figure 1 A-C looks almost identical. Was leakage of contrast medium observed? 2. What do you want to report by Figure 4C and 4D? These figures are difficult to understand. 3. In page 8, last line, the cavernous hemangioma showed the solid echo in EUS? 4. Only general considerations were described in discussion section. It is described that EUS is the best device for diagnosing cavernous hemangioma. Could you please describe the EUS findings in more detail? The actual EUS findings in the two cases also should be discussed. 5. Could you discuss the adaptation of endoscopic treatment in colorectal cavernous hemangioma patients?



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

Manuscript NO: 90926

Title: Endoscopic ultrasound-guided lauromacrogol injection for treatment of colorectal

cavernous hemangioma: Case report and literature review

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06109343 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Egypt

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-12-19

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-12-20 00:32

Reviewer performed review: 2023-12-29 23:24

Review time: 9 Days and 22 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[Y] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No creativity or innovation



Scientific significance of the	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair
conclusion in this manuscript	[] Grade D: No scientific significance
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) [] Minor revision [Y] 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

Comments: • Did you aspirate blood before injection of Lauromacrogol to be sure that you were inside a vessel? • What is the pulsed wave Doppler pattern of the injected vessel in the first case? • How did you calculate the amount of the injected Lauromacrogol needed to obliterate the hemangioma? You have injected about 27ml! • Why doing occult blood in stools in the presence of overt bleeding per rectum?! • You have injected Lauromacrogol into a vessel with arterial blood flow in the second case? • History of Osler Weber Rendu and Blue rubber bleb nevus syndromes should be asked for and mentioned in manuscript. • The classification of rectal hemangioma into localized and diffuse types, and capillary and cavernous types and their relation to the previously mentioned syndromes should be mentioned in the discussion section.



RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

Manuscript NO: 90926

Title: Endoscopic ultrasound-guided lauromacrogol injection for treatment of colorectal

cavernous hemangioma: Case report and literature review

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06109343 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Egypt

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-12-19

Reviewer chosen by: Meng-Liu Luo

Reviewer accepted review: 2024-02-02 12:01

Reviewer performed review: 2024-02-04 19:47

Review time: 2 Days and 7 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) [Y] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous



statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The point to point response is satisfactory, thanks