



**ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 25085

**Title:** Secondary aorto-esophageal fistula after thoracic aortic aneurysm endovascular repair treated by covered esophageal stenting

**Reviewer’s code:** 02577402

**Reviewer’s country:** China

**Science editor:** Shui Qiu

**Date sent for review:** 2016-02-23 14:19

**Date reviewed:** 2016-03-05 13:38

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" 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"/> No	

**COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

The author reported a rare case of aorto-esophageal fistula following endovascular repair of thoracic aortic aneurysm. Some problems existed. 1. Abstract: The abstract of a case report should be non-structural and should not have the title of case report and conclusion. Please delete the subtitle of “case report” and “conclusion” and just merge the content of these two subheadings into the whole abstract. Please refer to a published case report and write your abstract accordingly. Do not use Abbreviations in the abstract. Just use the full phrase of the abbreviations. If you have to use abbreviations, please give the complete phrase at first use. So, please give the complete phrases of GI and CT in the abstract. 2. Key words: please add the following words as new key words: Endovascular therapy, Aortic aneurysm, Bleeding. 3. Discussion: In this part, please replace “his” in the second line in the last third paragraph with “her” because this is a women. Add “of” after “the use” in the eighth line in the last third paragraph. 4. Figures: The quality of the figures is not good enough. Please give some better figures to display what you want to indicate.



**ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 25085

**Title:** Secondary aorto-esophageal fistula after thoracic aortic aneurysm endovascular repair treated by covered esophageal stenting

**Reviewer’s code:** 03026970

**Reviewer’s country:** China

**Science editor:** Shui Qiu

**Date sent for review:** 2016-02-23 14:19

**Date reviewed:** 2016-03-08 21:19

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"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input checked="" 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		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

**COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Comments: major revision. Aorto-esophageal fistula post-TEVAR is a rare but devastating complication. The treatment of this condition includes conservative management and aggressive surgical strategy, this case showed the role of stent insertion in controlling bleeding induced by aorto-esophageal fistula. Several similar cases have been reported, this case report did not add any new information, and several questions should be addressed. 1.The title is suboptimal, as it failed to express the highlight of this case about the role of esophageal stenting. 2.As the aim of this case report was to describe the role of stent insertion for AEF, it would be better just simply describe thoracic aortic aneurysm and TEVAR as history. 3. It would be better to provide endoscopic image about AEF and stent insertion, as well as image about migration and correction of the esophageal stent by X-ray. 4. In the discussion section, It is may be better if authors could describe some skills of stent insertion and give some suggestions about such emergency management. 5. Please provide the complete phrases for abbreviations at first use. 6. There are some spelling and grammar errors.



## BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

### ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 25085

**Title:** Secondary aorto-esophageal fistula after thoracic aortic aneurysm endovascular repair treated by covered esophageal stenting

**Reviewer's code:** 00736976

**Reviewer's country:** Greece

**Science editor:** Shui Qiu

**Date sent for review:** 2016-02-23 14:19

**Date reviewed:** 2016-02-26 19:11

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 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"/> 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		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I believe is a very rare case that the authors tread exelant with minimal impact to the patient we have before some years experence and publich a similar case and i am strongly suport that this less invasive procedure is the only posibility for this patients population