



**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>

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy*

Manuscript NO: 89326

Title: Coca-Cola Consumption versus Fragmentation in the Management of Patients with Phytobezoars: A Prospective Randomized Controlled Trial

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06197075

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Greece

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-10-28

Reviewer chosen by: Yu-Lu Chen

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-12-22 21:10

Reviewer performed review: 2023-12-24 07:50

Review time: 1 Day and 10 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>] Grade A: Excellent [<input 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

In general, it is an innovative paper, since, despite the multiple case reports and case series, authors are the first to perform a randomized clinical trial. Title, abstract and keywords are appropriate regarding content and form. In addition, methods and results are presented in an appropriate manner, based on the CONSORT guidelines. Regarding figures, a better description of the legends would be appropriate. Finally, no issues arise regarding biostatistics and ethical approval. Here are some proposed revisions: Major revisions • Regarding intervention group, Coca Cola consumption is stated to last 7 days in the abstract and 5 days in the main text. Please specify • Legends of figures 2 and 3 are not easy to understand. Are both of them from the intervention group? • Why was a second endoscopy performed in intervention group? Couldn't you define dissolution rate by imaging, such as CT, in order to avoid a second intervention? • At which time point was evaluation for Gastric ulcer rate performed? During initial endoscopy? During follow up? This point should be further elucidated. Minor revisions • Line 25 (onGPBs): a gap is missing • Regarding intervention group, Coca Cola consumption is stated to last 7 days in the abstract and 5 days in the main text. Please specify • Line 25: abbreviation

“GBs” is used without being introduced in the abstract • Line 29: “were” is not correct • Line 47-548: double use of the abbreviation instead of the full-term-should be corrected • Regarding inclusion/exclusion criteria, it would be advisable to declare the decision process for patients with history of upper GI surgery or known history of peptic ulcer disease • How was bezoar volume measured? With endoscopy or imaging? Please explain • Authors use multiple times the full text “gastric phetobezoar” instead of GBP, e.g. in legend of figure 3, even after introduction of abbreviation. Please adopt a consistency • In figure No 3, it is stated that “ the gastric ulcer became shallower”, obviously compared to Figure No2. However, it seems deeper. Please explain • In line 193, the name of Gaya et al would be preferable mentioned, since otherwise the reader assess that the authors refer to the present paper • Line 268: a gap is missing