



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 92417

Title: Optimization of tracheoesophageal fistula model established with T-shaped magnet system based on magnetic compression technique

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 04022623

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Adjunct Professor, Surgeon, Surgical Oncologist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Spain

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2024-01-25

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2024-02-14 06:48

Reviewer performed review: 2024-02-19 21:48

Review time: 5 Days and 14 Hours

| | |
|--|--|
| Scientific quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish |
| Novelty of this manuscript | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty |
| Creativity or innovation of this manuscript | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation |



| | |
|---|--|
| Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance |
| Language quality | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection |
| Conclusion | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection |
| Re-review | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Peer-reviewer statements | Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous |
| | Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Firstly, I would like to congratulate you by trying to add more information on this issue. I consider that your study needs to be slightly improved in some of its parts. I proceed to perform some commentaries for each manuscript section: In the ABSTRACT: • Line 67: in the methodology is suggested that both laringo or bronchoscopy and oesophago-gastroscopy are employed. • Line 73: why the authors selected 2 weeks for euthanasia in the study group? In the INTRODUCTION: • Minor changes are suggested in attached MS-Word document modified with Control Panel. In the MATERIAL AND METHODS section, we can mention: • Line 157: please add information about magnetic forces of the employed devices in both groups. • The surgical procedures are not very well described. The daughter magnet was inserted into the trachea... How? Under visual control? Until what point at the trachea? How? Please explain deeply this part of the procedure to other researchers could reproduce the experiments... The same commentary is added to figure 2 foot note. • Line 192: why authors elected the time of two weeks to sacrifice animals in experimental group? Why not one or three? This must be explained. • Line 199: How did time at which the magnets left the neck was observed?



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: office@baishideng.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

Periodical X-ray? Only animals coughing? Did the magnets appear in faeces? • Statistical analyses. Which statistical test was used to assess the normality of the study variables? • Other minor changes are suggested in attached MS-Word document modified with Control Panel. RESULTS SECTION: • Line 244: I suggest to add that TEF with T-shaped magnets are greater and with a shorter variability in their shape... • HISTOLOGY: very very poor information provided. Did any difference in inflammation pattern appeared? More information about histology could be presented... • Other minor changes are suggested in attached MS-Word document modified with Control Panel. DISCUSSION SECTION: • Line 258: What about the cost? Could authors include information about the costs of both types of magnetic devices? • Please add more information about the study limitations. • Other minor changes are suggested in attached MS-Word document modified with Control Panel. Newly I would like to congratulate authors for their work. Keep working in this way and trying to publish your research.