

# Review of: "Treatment Strategies for Recurrent Ileocolic Intussusceptions and a Novel Operative Procedure"

Erica Mazzotta

**Potential competing interests:** The author(s) declared that no potential competing interests exist.

The title should be modified : in this manuscript the Authors review only data of their casuistry and their approach to treat recurrent intussusception without describing "treatment strategies" as instead they declare in the title.

This sentence should be more streamline, it is too long and difficult to read: *"Surgery was performed on those patients who had findings of acute abdomen and complete intestinal obstruction or 2 failed attempts of UGHR for diagnostic purposes if a pathologic lead point was suspected based on patient findings and age"*

Which kind of patient are included in the study is not clear. If patient with ileo-ileal and colo-colic intussusception are excluded, it means that only patients with ileo-colic are included? In these cases, the ileo-cecal valve is itself the Lead Point. Why in the text it is claimed that no Lead Point was found?

In the section "The novel procedure", the Authors should describe only surgical technique without information about review method, patients and follow-up.

"The novel procedure" described was performed only in one patient. After how many intussusception the authors suggest to perform this surgery? Which are the risks and the possible complications of this type of surgery over time?

The Authors should report more concrete information to reinforce the validity of their approach to readers.