

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 68973

Title: Endoscopic extraction of a submucosal esophageal foreign body piercing into the thoracic aorta: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05382551

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Spain

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-09-25

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-10-03 13:01

Reviewer performed review: 2021-10-04 14:01

Review time: 1 Day

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] Anonymous [<input type="radio"/>] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [<input type="radio"/>] Yes [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] No
-------------------------------------	---

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The article is within the scope of the journal, and deals with a topic of interest. However, the item can't be accepted in the current state: a) A sufficiently detailed state of the question should be included to contextualize the experience described. b) The content should be organized into sections to clearly indicate the materials and methods used, and the results obtained. In other words, the index of the article should be: Introduction, State of the art, Materials, Methods, Results, Discussion, and Conclusions and future work. c) A section on conclusions and future work should also be included. d) Finally, the discussion section should show more clearly what the contributions of the experience described are compared to other similar studies.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 68973

Title: Endoscopic extraction of a submucosal esophageal foreign body piercing into the thoracic aorta: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06109343

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Egypt

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-09-25

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-10-03 12:39

Reviewer performed review: 2021-10-09 00:01

Review time: 5 Days and 11 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

**Peer-reviewer
statements**Peer-Review: ☒ Anonymous ☐ OnymousConflicts-of-Interest: ☐ Yes ☒ No**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Comments: I should congratulate the authors for the very valuable and rare case. Why the patient was admitted after 5 days? Due to the increase in the chest pains? Was esophagoscopy done in the ENT and not Gastroenterology and Endoscopy department? Why the first esophagoscopy failed to see the nodule that was seen by the second endoscopy? There should be some information about the type of the aortic stent! i think you have used CO2 during the endoscopy done to extract the fishbone, if so, you better mention that in the manuscript.