Reviewer’s report

Title: A literature review and case report of severe and refractory post-colectomy enteritis

Version: 0 Date: 26 Nov 2018

Reviewer: Reviewer 2

Reviewer's report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses a testable research question(s) (brief or other article types: is there a clear objective)?
Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?
Yes - the approach is appropriate

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?
No - there are minor issues

Statistics - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?
N/A - there are no statistics in this study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?
No - there are minor issues

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Is the current version of this work technically sound? If not, can revisions be made to make the work technically sound?
Probably - with minor revisions

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: The authors have written a clear case report which is comprehensible and provides information on a disease of interest.

The manuscript would benefit from the authors clarifying their methods and specifying relevant limitations.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:
1. The authors have reviewed the literature, but the paper would benefit from adding more detail on the search strategy used, so that other researchers could replicate the search. For example,
what time period for publication was considered? Which languages were searched? What was the date of the search? Were there any exclusion criteria?
2. The authors have proposed a diagnostic algorithm and treatment strategy based on a very small number of case reports. It would be valuable for readers if the authors could expand in the discussion on how the evidence they have supports this algorithm, and what experiments would be able to provide evidence to support its use (RCTs, observational studies etc.).
3. The authors should add descriptive captions or titles to each figure, to clarify what each panel shows and make it more comprehensible to readers.
4. The current way the timeline of the case is presented was confusing to this reader. Please consider labelling the colour of the boxes and making the grey timeline linear.

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:
In general the English standard is good, but I suggest authors review the paper with a native English speaker as there are a number of spelling or typographical errors that cause confusion.

Note: This reviewer report can be downloaded - see attached pdf file.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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