

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

ESPS manuscript NO: 12531

Title: Incarcerated amyand hernia

Reviewer's code: 02537595

Reviewer's country: South Korea

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2014-07-14 13:20

Date reviewed: 2014-08-11 22:00

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	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

The manuscript is the report of 2 cases with literature review. However, the authors didn't describe about the followup of the patients and the postoperative outcomes. In both cases, hernias were repaired with prolene mesh after appendicectomy through the same wound, Such practice is not the standard of treatment. Authors mentioned about the standard of treatment from literature in the Table 1 but authors didn't explain why they had chosen the non-standard treatment and what was the long term outcomes. (Authors only mentioned that patients were discharged without complications on 2nd and 1st post op day respectively without mentioning about the long term followup of the patients) The literature review in the discussion was in-comprehensive. Abstract and Conclusion are not impressive. There were some spelling, grammar and typo error.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

ESPS manuscript NO: 12531

Title: Incarcerated amyand hernia

Reviewer's code: 02953899

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2014-07-14 13:20

Date reviewed: 2014-08-03 00:43

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Matter of interest: it is an extremely interesting cases series, the authors described two cases of Amyand's hernia in two adult male patients. But the manuscript need a major revision. **CASES** 1. The description of the two cases is very poor, there is only an image for two cases. Before the manuscript can be taken into consideration for publication, authors should report at least one other image of the Case 1, to document the operation performed. 2. Why they used a mesh repair in Case 1 where the appendix was gangrenous? I think that authors should justify this choice. 3. What was the finding of the histological examination of the appendicitis removed? **DISCUSSION** The discussion should be focused on these points: 1. Imaging and preoperative diagnosis 2. when should be performed appendectomy and when you should not perform? 3. Mesh repair versus no mesh repair The Table 1 is the Losanoff and Basson's proposed classification system for staging and management of Amyand's hernia? **Language:** grammatical and linguistic revision need to be performed by English native speaker.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

ESPS manuscript NO: 12531

Title: Incarcerated amyand hernia

Reviewer's code: 00535653

Reviewer's country: Colombia

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2014-07-14 13:20

Date reviewed: 2014-08-04 05:55

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	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

It is a nice report of two cases. I dont see new information related with the disease.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

ESPS manuscript NO: 12531

Title: Incarcerated amyand hernia

Reviewer's code: 00159342

Reviewer's country: India

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2014-07-14 13:20

Date reviewed: 2014-07-15 17:17

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade B: Minor language	<input type="checkbox"/> [] The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> [] High priority for
<input type="checkbox"/> [] Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Duplicate publication	publication
<input type="checkbox"/> [] Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Grade C: A great deal of	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> [] Grade E: Poor	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> [] The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> [] Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> [] Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thanks for the opportunity. Congratulation to the authors, this is a good report of 2 rare cases. Worth publishing after minor changes. In DISCUSSION Section: 1. The authors mention "Both patients were discharged from the hospital with complications" : what were these 'complications'? 2. In my opinion, 'Mesh or no mesh' - that should form majority of the discussion in this case. The authors should clearly state their justification for using mesh in Case #1 where the appendix was infected. 3. The Table shows classification of Amyand hernia. Is this the author's own or quoted from another study? There is no reference for the Table. 4. In the Table, for Type 4, the 'Definition' & 'Surgical Management' are confusing