

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Otorhinolaryngology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 16976

**Title:** Management of post-operative fistula in head and neck surgery: Sweeping it under the carpet?

**Reviewer's code:** 02277329

**Reviewer's country:** United Kingdom

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2015-02-07 14:52

**Date reviewed:** 2015-02-09 03:18

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Management of Post-Operative Fistulas in Head and Neck Surgery: Sweeping it Under the Carpet? This is a substantial piece of work. It could be improved by clearly articulating the aims and robusting describing the methods. It is not written in the context of a systematic literature review and hence might be viewed as authors own opinions supported by selected references. It would be helpful to present data in tables and make comparisons across the literature such as range of fistula rates, risk factors most common in the various papers, units different approach to management, trends over time. What evidence is there at the fistula rates are increasing and in what groups of patients.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Otorhinolaryngology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 16976

**Title:** Management of post-operative fistula in head and neck surgery: Sweeping it under the carpet?

**Reviewer's code:** 00503729

**Reviewer's country:** Italy

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2015-02-07 14:52

**Date reviewed:** 2015-03-05 01:06

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [ Y] Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [ Y] Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [ Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [ Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [ Y] No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a good comprehensive review of a nasty complication. I appreciated the wisdom and common sense of the Authors in describing numerous preventive and therapeutic options. Minor spelling errors need to be revised.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Otorhinolaryngology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 16976

**Title:** Management of post-operative fistula in head and neck surgery: Sweeping it under the carpet?

**Reviewer's code:** 00503689

**Reviewer's country:** Egypt

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2015-02-07 14:52

**Date reviewed:** 2015-02-11 14:53

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a review of a collection of various aspects of these complications. However there is no real outline of a working plan and no personal view of your experience or management protocol.