

55556-Answering Reviewers

Reviewer #1:

Specific Comments to Authors: This is a well written case. I just have minor suggestions. 1. The term lithotripsy should to my opinion be changed for endoscopic fragmentation

Response: Many thanks for your positive comments on our work and manuscript. We have checked the whole text and modified term lithotripsy to endoscopic fragmentation as suggested.

2. Line 161: “upper GI endoscopy” rather than “gastroscopy”.

Response: Thank you for your suggestions. We have revised gastroscopy to upper gastrointestinal endoscopy.

3. Line 203: “indigestible fibres (cellulose, hemicellulose, tannin and lignin) from vegetables and fruits”

Response: Thank you for your suggestions. We have revised the sentence to “Phytobezoars are composed of indigestible fibres (cellulose, hemicellulose, tannin and lignin) from vegetables and fruits”.

4. Line 209 I would suggest to suppress “, and the lack of an acidic environment prevents the formation of bezoars”.

Response: Thank you for your suggestions. We have revised the whole sentence to “Under normal circumstances, with esophageal self- clearance mechanisms, such as esophageal peristalsis, saliva, and erect posture, food passes through the esophagus quickly and does not usually remain in the esophagus, and those prevent the formation of bezoars”.

Reviewer #2:

Specific Comments to Authors: I read with interest this manuscript by Zhang

and co-workers. The authors performed a good description of the case and review of literature. The work was conducted with a good methodology and it carries some interesting results.

Response: Many thanks for your positive comments on our work and manuscript.

Editorial Office's comments

(1) Science Editor: 1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes a case report of the acute esophageal obstruction caused by reverse migration of gastric bezoars. The topic is within the scope of the WJCC. (1) Classification: Grade B and Grade C; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: The reviewer #05201786 thinks the authors perform a good description of the case and review of literature. The work is conducted with a good methodology and it carries some interesting results. The reviewer #03729678 thinks the term lithotripsy should be changed for endoscopic fragmentation, upper GI endoscopy rather than gastroscopy. The authors should suppress "and the lack of an acidic environment prevents the formation of bezoars". (3) Format: There are 2 figures. A total of 18 references are cited. There is no references published in the last 3 years and no self-citation. 2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade A and Grade B. A language editing certificate issued by MedE was provided. 3 Academic norms and rules: The authors provided the Signed Informed Consent Form and the CARE Checklist-2016. The authors signed the Copyright License Agreement and the Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure Form. No academic misconduct was found in the CrossCheck detection and Bing search. 4 Supplementary comments: This is an unsolicited manuscript. The study was without financial support. The topic has not previously been published in the WJCC. 5 Issues raised: (1) The authors did not provide original pictures. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor. 6

Re-review: Not required. 7 Recommendation: Conditional acceptance. (Han Zhang)

Response: Thank you for your positive comments on our work and manuscript. Based on your comments, we have prepared and arranged the original figures using PowerPoint, and all graphs, arrows, and text portions can be reprocessed by the editor.

(2) Editorial Office Director: I have checked the comments written by the science editor.

Response: Thank you for your comments.

(3) Company Editor-in-Chief: I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, the full text of the manuscript, the relevant ethics documents, and the English Language Certificate, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Clinical Cases, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors.

Response: Thank you for your positive comments on our work and manuscript. We have revised the manuscript according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors.