

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 8677

Title: NASOGASTRIC TUBE AS PROTECTION FOR RECURRENT OESOPHAGEAL STRICTURE – A CASE REPORT

Reviewer code: 02822816

Science editor: Qi, Yuan

Date sent for review: 2014-01-02 19:49

Date reviewed: 2014-01-12 01:41

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

To the authors, I must congratulate you for helping this unhappy boy and for your device registered at Polish Patent Office. However, I have concerns about the manuscript and several corrections should be made before being accepted for publication. Throughout the text, including the legends of figures and tables, English language must be corrected (perhaps, seek a professional English language editing company). Abstract: last paragraph is rather confused and should be re-written. Case reports: Fourth paragraph: it is hard to believe that “tolerability of the tube was satisfactory”. Please, specify what does it mean? Page 8, second paragraph: “method well accepted by patient (not by patent!), but “decreased life quality” and caused “recurrent infections of respiratory tract”-is confused and should be re-written Page 8, last paragraph: “At the time of publication, the patient is well”, obviously you don’t know the time of publication, but the time of submission! Discussion -page 9, second paragraph: “the tolerance of the tube was limited..” contrasts with “method well tolerated” (page 8) Page 9, last paragraph: please, indicate reference, no only Ataben et al and Mutaf. Page 10, last paragraph: is it conclusion of your manuscript? Then, it must be rewritten.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 8677

Title: NASOGASTRIC TUBE AS PROTECTION FOR RECURRENT OESOPHAGEAL STRICTURE – A CASE REPORT

Reviewer code: 02861209

Science editor: Qi, Yuan

Date sent for review: 2014-01-02 19:49

Date reviewed: 2014-01-22 00:57

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting report about a difficult to treat post-corrosive injury of the oesophagus. The nasogastric presented in this case report may be an alternative treatment option in selected cases. Nevertheless prior to publication I would ask the authors to answer following questions. 1. Were there any hospitalisations due to infectious complications (e.g. pneumonia) after implementation of the perforated tube? 2. How much weight and height did the patient gain during treatment? 3. How long can the naso-gastral tube stay in situ? What was the longest time period your tube stayed in situ in this patient? Did there ever happen any kind of occlusion or migration that lead to removal or change of the naso-gastral tube?

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 8677

Title: NASOGASTRIC TUBE AS PROTECTION FOR RECURRENT OESOPHAGEAL STRICTURE – A CASE REPORT

Reviewer code: 02733492

Science editor: Qi, Yuan

Date sent for review: 2014-01-02 19:49

Date reviewed: 2014-01-24 03:31

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I think that a more detailed description of the patented tube should be done to facilitate reader understand how the tube is constructed. It would be interesting to discuss also if the tube or a similar one, can be used in adults as well.