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Reviewer's report:

"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? Yes

Reviewer comments: HAVE THE AUTHORS RESPONDED ADEQUATELY TO EACH OF THE QUESTIONS YOU RAISED IN YOUR COMMENTS?

Yes these authors have responded in a very courteous way and appropriately to my suggestions to markedly I prove the paper. I hope they understand that I was not criticizing THEM but rather their editing service. I can only imagine trying to write a paper in Chinese characters!

HAVE THEY MADE THE APPROPRIATE CHANGES IN THE MANUSCRIPT?

Yes in large part

WHAT IS YOUR OVERALL IMPRESSION OF THE REVISED MANUSCRIPT?

I like the concept and would suggest the editor pursue this manuscript. Still it will need the help of an editing service that I assume the journal publisher's editors can do. I reiterate that I hope these authors reproached the original editing service and asked for their money back because that editing service did a TERRIBLE JOB!!!!!!
REQUESTED REVISIONS:

ARE THERE ANY ADDITIONAL REVISIONS THE AUTHORS SHOULD MAKE?

1. Abstract: I would suggest that you add the phrase "Various types of medical glues/adhesives/topical coagulants' which we will refer to as medical glues (MG)". This would cover the multiple types being used currently!

2. Abstract line 7: Change to "a the possible inappropriate use of the medical glue B- butyl-2-cyanoacrylate ". Reads better

3. Abstract line 12: change to "intestinal obstruction related to a mass of residual non-absorbed MG causing an internal hernia from a dense adhesion"

4. Page 3 line 2: Again I would say "In surgical practice, various forms of topical medical glues (MG) have widespread application as an adhesive or a topical anticoagulant"

5. Page 3 line 10: Change "was effective" to "appeared to be effective in minimizing the occurrence of a delayed duodenal perforation"

6. Page 3 line 13: Start a new paragraph here

7. Page 3 line 17: Change "dissemination" to "distal embolization"

8. Page 3 line 19: Add the words "can be" after the word "but"

9. From now on I really cannot define every place that needs these subtle but important changes so I will concentrate of the bigger picture. The journal editor and the publisher's editing service should deal with the type of edits I have suggested above.
10. Page 4 line 7: Add the word "into" after "eroding"

Page 4 line 11: Change "roughening" to "irregularity"

Page 4 line 12: Delete the phrase "fat place" and only say "fat plane"

Page 4 line 17: Delete the word "pierced" this word is not appropriate, say "eroded"

Page 4 line 19: Delete the phrase "and embedded it in the neuromuscular layer". I have no idea what you mean by this phrase nor the next sentence which can also be deleted because it makes no sense.

11. Page 5 line 18: Delete the end of the sentence after the word "and". Remember, of course you sent her home only after passing flatus and stool etc., no need to say that.

12. Page 6 line 1: Put the word "close" in quotes like I just did because this is NOT an accepted way to "close" a mesenteric defect!

13. Page 6 line 10: Replace the phrase "partial enterectomy" with "small bowel resection and primary enteroenterostomy"

14. Page 6 line 16: Add the phrase "using appropriate indications" after the word "agent"

15. Page 6 line 21: Add the phrase "in time, probably because of excessive quantities used"

16. Page 7 lines 2 and 3: Change to "Because of what appears to be excessive application of"

17. Page 7 line 8: Change to "The inappropriate and possibly excessive use of MG to "close" an operative mesenteric defect"
18. Page 7 line 13: Delete "injure" and replace by "adhere to and erode into surrounding tissues and hollow organs like the gut"

19. Page 12 line 2: Change "gastroscopic" to duodenoscopic" or "endoscopic"

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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