

**ESPS Peer-review Report**

**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 4833

**Title:** Emergency Admissions due to Swallowed Foreign Bodies in Adults

**Reviewer code:** 02438759

**Science editor:** Song, Xiu-Xia

**Date sent for review:** 2013-07-26 13:09

**Date reviewed:** 2013-07-31 11:40

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"/> Existed	<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	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

**COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

The present study is a retrospective analysis of 100 patients who with complaints related to foreign body ingestions. They suggested that plain radiography is especially useful in localization of radio-opaque foreign bodies, while fiberoptic methods can be used both as diagnostic and therapeutic tools regardless of the radiopacity of the foreign body ingested. The study has some interesting and referenced significant for clinical treatment of complaints related to foreign body ingestions. Comments: Fig2 and Fig3 the foreign bodies is labeled with arrow tips.

**ESPS Peer-review Report**

**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 4833

**Title:** Emergency Admissions due to Swallowed Foreign Bodies in Adults

**Reviewer code:** 00289422

**Science editor:** Song, Xiu-Xia

**Date sent for review:** 2013-07-26 13:09

**Date reviewed:** 2013-08-01 16:48

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

**COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

It would be better to structure the abstract in purpose, materials-methods, results, conclusion. It is not clear enough how the foreign body was detected in the 7 patients who had neither x-ray nor endoscopy. In the discussion part it would be better if an algorithm concerning the diagnostic approach in children comparing with adults could be given. The value of ultrasonography should also be discussed specifically in paediatrics. The authors should not repeat in the discussion part the numbers that have already been written in the results part. More x-ray images would enhance the quality of the paper. All references should be numbered in the order they appear in the text.

## ESPS Peer-review Report

**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 4833

**Title:** Emergency Admissions due to Swallowed Foreign Bodies in Adults

**Reviewer code:** 00504427

**Science editor:** Song, Xiu-Xia

**Date sent for review:** 2013-07-26 13:09

**Date reviewed:** 2013-08-09 18:26

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This article is a retrospective analysis of 100 adult patients complaining foreign body ingestions. Authors insist that radiography is especially useful for diagnosis of the localization of radio-opaque foreign bodies, while endoscopy can be useful for treatment as well as diagnosis in any type of foreign bodies. As a whole, this article is a well-designed scientific paper. Many articles regarding foreign body ingestion have been published. From this point of view, this article seems to be lacking originality. However, I believe this article should be helpful for the management of ingested foreign bodies in adult. I confirmed the accuracy of the contents, and some minor revision is necessary for publication. Please see the reviewer's comments below, and respond to these comments in the revised manuscript.

**Comment 1** Content of abstract is too complicated for readers. Authors should structure the abstract in purpose, methods, results, and conclusion orders.

**Comment 2** In figure 1, foreign body was detected in 7 patients, who received neither x-ray nor endoscopic examination. How could authors detect the foreign body in these cases? Describe the diagnostic process in greater detail.

**Comment 3** The discussion paragraph, authors repeat the results (number, percentage), which have already been written in the result paragraph. Authors should delete these redundant data from the discussion paragraph.

**Comment 4** There are no endoscopic pictures compared to x-ray images. Some endoscopic images (with removal of foreign bodies) would make more impact on this paper.