

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 11197

Title: Biodegradable stent compared to balloon dilatation for benign oesophageal stricture: a pilot randomised controlled trial.

Reviewer code: 00061678

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2014-05-08 19:44

Date reviewed: 2014-05-14 01:54

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair		BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Editor, Authors. Thank you for sending the study "Biodegradable stent compared to standard balloon dilatation for benign oesophageal stricture: a pilot randomized controlled trial." for revision. Please accept the following comments - good research idea as it is an important clinical entity. - frequent spelling and grammatical mistakes should be revised. - The study has a good design. - Need more number of patients for results confirmation. Thanks

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 11197

Title: Biodegradable stent compared to balloon dilatation for benign oesophageal stricture: a pilot randomised controlled trial.

Reviewer code: 00158526

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2014-05-08 19:44

Date reviewed: 2014-05-23 16:41

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existing	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Review for the manuscript No:11197 Biodegradable stent compared to standard balloon dilatation for benign esophageal stricture: a pilot randomised controlled trial. General comments: This is a nice pilot study that compares biodegradable stents and balloon dilatation. It is a well-designed study that unfortunately was not completed due to lack of included patients. Beside that I have minor remarks: - in the introduction section in the third paragraph eosinophilic esophagitis as a cause of benign esophageal strictures was not mentioned - in the part of complications the authors almost didn't mention thoracic pain as the most frequent complication after stent placement or col- lapse of the biodegradable stent inside the esophageal lumen ? - I strongly believe that Table 2: Baseline Comorbidities should be removed due to lack of included patients Therefore I classified the manuscript Biodegradable stent compared to standard balloon dilatation for benign oesophageal stricture: a pilot randomised controlled trial into grade B. According to the language evaluation the revised article is evaluated as grade B. I conclude that the authors should make above mentioned changes in the article. After they correct the proposed changes, I think you should accept the manuscript for the publication.