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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?

Yes - the author's interpretation is reasonable
OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Is the current version of this work technically sound? If not, can revisions be made to make the work technically sound?

Maybe - with major revisions

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: Overall Impression

The topic is good and potentially important but the writing is unsatisfactory and the best advice I can give the authors is to use a scientific editing service because the writing is not satisfactory. I do understand the authors difficulty and am sympathetic but they need professional help with their writing any reader will bail out after the first paragraph.

What have the authors done well

the topic is an interesting one that is not well reported in the recent literature and they have 3 case reports that support their purpose of reporting this complication of fibrin glue

How does it not meet best practice

This is in essence a series of 3 case reports that support the concept of complications of fibrin glue. There really is not best practice involved -this is more of a warning that if used inappropriately, fibrin glue can lead to intraabdominal complications related to non resorption of the fibrin glue

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

See below for suggestions to the authors

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

Comments to authors

1 Page 2 line 24 hemofecia is not a word I think you mean hematochezia
2. what do you mean by "foreign bodies" in the abstract. Were these fibrin concretions? Needs explaining

3. the phrase "massive researches " is not appropriate use "a great deal of research has"

4. The data as in ref 3 is anecdotal and many other references do not support this claim. Delete the reference to colorectal anastomoses

5. Page 4 when describing the foreign bodies seen on endoscopy be certain to say that they were seen "eroding into the duodenal lumen"

6. Case 1 please describe how fibrin flue was used and where during the laparoscopic colectomy

6. Page 3 line 39 what is Schulze evagination" reword this entire part from line 36 to line 45

7. Page 3 line 53. What do you mean by " three vascular clamps" were these metal instruments left in the abdomen after the prior operation? I do not see them in the CT. It appears that you are using the phrase "vascular clamps" inappropriately are these vascular cold?

8. Did patient 3 get operated because of peritonitis ?

9. Page 5 line 31 change enteroscopy to colonoscopy

10. Where was the fibrin glue used in the previous operation and what is an "uplift"?

11. Page 5 line 34 change to colonic lumen
12. How can a CT describe "turbid surrounding fay space" do mean chronic inflammation or phlegmon?

13. Page 5 line 39 did this patient have peritonitis such that you call it colonic perforation. If not the a better phrase would be "colonic erosion"

14. Page 6 line 9 what do you mean by"effusion of the small intestine"?do you mean air fluid levels?

15. Why was a partial eneyerectomy necessary? Did you make an enterotomy during mobilization or was the bowel strangulated?

16. Page 10 line 47 change "incarcerated" to "eroding into"

17. My best advice to you is to get help from a scientific editing service- no journal will accept a manuscript that has so many problems with English. I am very sympathetic to you and the difficulties writing in a non native language but you really need help. Use a service that is scientific not just a native English speaking service. You have a definite message and one that is not well appreciated but for it to be publishable you need to be able to describe the problem well. Good luck.

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.

Yes

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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