

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 70723

Title: Neck and mediastinal hematoma caused by a foreign body in the esophagus with

diagnostic difficulties: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06079186

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: South Korea

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-08-15

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-08-16 00:17

Reviewer performed review: 2021-08-16 00:42

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	 [] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	 [] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No



Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous
statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you for submitting a case report on an interesting topic. A detailed description of the contents of the food is required. This is because the large foreign objects in the photo are not expected to be contained in the steamed stuffed bun and soup. Please describe the time from swallowing the foreign body to the CT scan and the time to surgery. The patient had elevated WBC and CRP and dyspnea. You need to explain that patient has not been tested or quarantined for COVID-19. 109/L on line 84 needs correction.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 70723

Title: Neck and mediastinal hematoma caused by a foreign body in the esophagus with

diagnostic difficulties: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05226306

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: FACS, MBBS, MCh, MD, MNAMS

Professional title: Additional Professor, Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-08-15

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-08-17 02:53

Reviewer performed review: 2021-08-17 07:04

Review time: 4 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	 [] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	 [] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[]Yes [Y]No



Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous
statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. On retrospect, could the history of crab ingestion have made a difference in management? 2. Pg 4 lines 77-8 : "...She denied any.." Was the pt male or female? 3. How long was the duration from onset of symptoms to intubation? 4. The treatment given is not clear. Was the pt subjected to endoscopy followed by open surgery? What was the incision, how large was the esophageal rent? What suture was used for esophageal rent closure? 5. What is the "..peripheral nerve pressure release.." (pg 5 line 102) procedure? 6. How long was the pt followed up? 7. What vessels were damaged. How was the damage repaired ? (pg 7 line 149 : "damaging the blood vessels") 8. In retrospect, could airway stabilisation be putforth as the foremost objective in such a case, before attempting removal / definitive management?