

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 31566

Title: Nerve preserving vs standard laparoscopic sacropexy: Postoperative bowel function

Reviewer's code: 00631847

Reviewer's country: Taiwan

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-11-27 16:38

Date reviewed: 2016-12-04 16:33

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

It is a well written manuscript concerning the outcome of nerve preserving procedure in laparoscopic sacropexy focusing on the outcome of bowel function. It is very helpful for the readers. The paper should be published.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 31566

Title: Nerve preserving vs standard laparoscopic sacropexy: Postoperative bowel function

Reviewer's code: 03658410

Reviewer's country: Greece

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-11-27 16:38

Date reviewed: 2016-12-16 18:05

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 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 checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Authors aimed to compare their developed nerve preserving technique with the non-nerve preserving one in terms of de novo bowel symptoms. They suggested that their nerve preserving technique seems superior in terms of prevention of de novo bowel dysfunction compared to the standard one and had no major intraoperative complications. Comments: 1. Please report on patients quality of life indices after operation. 2. Please report on any case that needed re-operation or switch from one technique to the other, and the reasons for this switch. 3. Please decrease discussion by half and please discuss in a short paragraph the learning curve of this technique. 4. Please ammend references to the journal style.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 31566

Title: Nerve preserving vs standard laparoscopic sacropexy: Postoperative bowel function

Reviewer's code: 03647717

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-11-27 16:38

Date reviewed: 2016-12-20 21:02

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

Re: Nerve preserving versus standard laparoscopic sacropexy: postoperative bowel function Dear sir, thank you very much for your effort to describe the manuscript about the clinical efficacy of Nerve preserving laparoscopic sacropexy. I think it is a meaningful article in terms of the study for the treatment of apical prolapse. The limitation of this study is retrospective, however, I think this manuscript is well done and I have nothing to change.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 31566

Title: Nerve preserving vs standard laparoscopic sacropexy: Postoperative bowel function

Reviewer's code: 03069247

Reviewer's country: United Arab Emirates

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-11-27 16:38

Date reviewed: 2016-12-21 11:44

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] 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"/> [Y] 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"/> [Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thanks for the authors, a well written paper