

ESPS JOURNAL EDITOR-IN-CHIEF'S REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 21969

Title: Contained colonic perforation due to cecal retroflexion

Journal Editor-in-Chief (Associate Editor): Daniel T Farkas

Country: United States

Editorial Director: Jin-Lei Wang

Date sent for review: 2015-10-12 09:01

Date reviewed: 2015-10-15 01:50

ACADEMIC CONTENT EVALUATION	LANGUAGE QUALITY EVALUATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair		
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection

JOURNAL EDITOR-IN-CHIEF (ASSOCIATE EDITOR) COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a retrospective review being fit into a case report format. The peer review comment was that this was more amenable to a case report, and perhaps how this came about. But in the end it's not quite a case report, and it's not really a full retrospective study manuscript. (If it was, I'd have other questions.) I think this should be revised to be a case report as it is being called. Including in the report some limited results of your first 607 cases would also be appropriate. But trying to shoehorn this whole comparison of "with vs without" retroflexion into a case report is not appropriate. (And maybe the whole thing can be repackaged and submitted as a complete retrospective review.)