



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 Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 30521

Title: Adult Intussusception: A retrospective review

Reviewer's code: 03004220

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2016-10-09 16:25

Date reviewed: 2016-10-10 20:24

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		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 an interesting review on a rare condition. These are my comments: 1. the author should state in the abstract and in the manuscript that he is reporting his experience and is discussing the current evidence available from the literature 2. the results in the abstract are a bit confusing. I suggest to structure this section better: for instance, the sentences "Small bowel enteroscopy excluded pathology in 4 cases (37%) with AI" and "There were 6 entero-enteric, 4 ileocecal, and 1 sigmoid-rectal AI" should be reported earlier in the text 3. Some tables summarizing the studies already published in the literature might help the reader better understand the current evidence available on this topic.



ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 30521

Title: Adult Intussusception: A retrospective review

Reviewer’s code: 02861605

Reviewer’s country: United States

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2016-10-09 16:25

Date reviewed: 2016-11-21 11:21

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"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		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

1.It should be emphasized that this study is more along the lines of a case series given the limited number of patients included. The title, intro, and/or methods should indicate this. 2.The introduction is somewhat limited. For example, there is a discussion of the historical context of this entity and management in the discussion section that would be appropriate to include in the introduction instead. 3.The sentence in the intro, “The frequent use of computed tomography (CT) for abdominal imaging has led to increased detection of transient intussusceptions with no apparent underlying disease,” is essentially copied from the cited reference with only change of “the frequent use of” from “the growing use of” Either this sentence needs to be quoted or changed. Also, explaining here the term “transient” intussusception (i.e. most are persistent or recurrent) would benefit the reader as this is a term that most are likely not familiar with. 4.The methods section is also too short and should be modified and added to. Other information could be added to strengthen the study description. For example were there exclusion criteria? Were there patients that carried diagnosis (ICD codes) that didn’t go to surgery or were only those that went to surgery included? This should be described. In the results it says, “None of the patients had prior abdominal operations.” Was this an exclusion



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>

criterion or were all patients coincidentally never had prior abdominal surgery? Also, how many surgeons were involved? Elaboration on the critical info the author was looking for in each patient should be described. 5. There should be some mention of limitations to this study in the discussion, most importantly the limited number of patients from which conclusions overall are limited.