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REVISION ASSESSMENT FROM THE ACADEMIC PEER REVIEWER:

Has the author addressed your concerns sufficiently for you to now recommend the work as a technically sound contribution? No

Reviewer comments: Have the authors answered all your queries?

Yes but several times not appropriately.

Have the authors added changes in the text to address the queries?

Yes but the paper needs extensive editing by a surgeon or an editing service that is a scientific one that knows medical and surgical terms.

What is your overall opinion?

This paper has a definite message but it is very poorly written and the editing service they used did a VERY LOUSY JOB. This "editing service" does not have editors who are scientists or clinicians and it is obvious. I would suggest that the authors send my review back to them and ask for their money back. I would suggest that the editor of the respective journal uses his/her editors to make this more acceptable. I GAVE MANY SUGGESTIONS BUT THERE ARE MANY OTHER POORLY WORDED PLACES AS WELL.

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

Are there other changes that need to be made?
1. Page 2 line 4 Add the phrase "of intestinal anastomoses or sites of potential leakage of fluid" after the word "reinforcement". Also I have no idea how fibrin glue has been used for "wound protection"! Delete this and replace the term "adhesion" with "adhesion of two structures together"

2. Line 9 Don't you mean "intestinal obstruction"? It would make more sense

3. Line 14 Replace the phrase after the word "and" with "an internal hernia related to use of fibrin glue"

4. Line 16 Replace "duodenal suturing" with "operative closure of the site of duodenal erosion"

5. From now on I will not correct every inappropriate use of words or phrases of which there are many-this is for the journal editors to do, but I will address places that are unclear or meaningless

6. Page 4 line 7 Delete the word "patch", no idea what you mean by this term

7. Page 4 line 3 Better not specify just FG and use the term "tissue glues" instead of FG because your references are not all on FG, same on line 12. Then start a new paragraph on line 17 to from now on limit the paper to FG- remember your paper is on FG not all tissue glues.

8. Line 8 What is tissue "shielding"? I have absolutely no idea and I am a surgeon! This needs to be reworded

9. Page 5 line 3 Delete the word "radical"

10. Page 5 line 4 Change "gastroscope" to "upper endoscopy"
Then the phrase "foreign bodies covering the anterior aspect of the duodenum"...how can endoscopy show this?- delete it or if you mean these foreign bodies were seen on CT then add it to the next sentence.

11. Line 10 Delete "turbid surroundings fatty spaces", this terminology is meaningless (your editing service did not give you good advice!) change to loss of the fat plane between the serosa of the duodenum and the surrounding inflamed retroperitoneal tissue. This entire sentence needs to be reworded "rough edge of local intestinal wall" is sloppy and not appropriate.

12. Line 12 What does "colloidal" mean? Again the editing service did a lousy job!

13. Line 14 What do you mean passed through the mesentery?

14. Line 15 "intermittent" should be changed to "interrupted", again lousy job by editing service I would ask for your money back and show them this review!!!!!

15. In case 1 did you do any pathological evaluation of the foreign bodies? Did the previous operative note describe the use of FG during the case? How do you know they used FG instead of other tissue glue? You need to define this exactly and not make any assumptions. See line 2 page 5

16. Page 5 line 2 What type of an ovarian "tumor"? This may be very important!

17. Page 5 line 4 Change to "mass protruding into the lumen surrounded by a hard, dark brown substance at 50cm from the anus"

18. Line 5 "non-uniform" what do you mean? Heterogeneous? Localized? Non-uniform is meaningless
19. Line 7 "rough" is meaningless

20. Line 7 "unclear surroundings fatty gap" is meaningless, your editing service did a lousy job!!!!!!! This is not scientific or clinical terminology, ask for your money back!

21. Line 11 "entero-anastomosis" is not appropriate, why not just say "with a primary colo-colostomy" which is the appropriate word

22. Page 6 line 20 "effusion" again is not appropriate, say "revealed dilation and fluid distension"
Line 21 I really doubt that the diagnosis preoperatively was "internal hernia", it would have been "adhesive obstruction" preop diagnosis of an internal hernia is quite unusual!

23. Page 7 lines 4 and 5 Where are the foreign bodies located? Did they form the "hernia ring? If not, then how can you say the intestinal obstruction was related to the use of FG? If not you had better delete this case.

24. Page 7 line 16 This needs to be added to line 4 page 4 and what do you mean by "massive volume"? Better be exact! Do you have the amount of FG they used? if not then you cannot say "massive volumes"

25. Page 7 line 20 how can you say that it was an "overdose"? How much did they use? Do you know? If not then do not make claims that you cannot prove

26. Page 7 line 22 Why not just say "these foreign bodies from the nondegraded FG then eroded the colon causing an intestinal obstruction" because that is what you found!
27. Page 8 line 4 Again you claim "overuse of FG", reword and just say "use of FG appears to have caused" and delete the phrase "excessive adhesions" Line 7 you claim that the "spraying thickness" is important -how do you know that? Lines 8 and 9 do you have any evidence of this? You are making too many statements that you cannot prove. Line 11 change to "Excessive application of FG appears to be able to lead to the". Then later on delete the term dosage and spraying thickness" and just say "amount" here as well as on line 19

28. Page 13 Delete frames c, g, j, and l, they add little to your paper

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

Yes

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

Yes

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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