

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 22716

Title: Endoscopic Dilation of Complete Oesophageal Obstructions with a Combined Antegrade-Retrograde Rendezvous Technique

Reviewer's code: 00504581

Reviewer's country: Spain

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2015-09-17 11:07

Date reviewed: 2015-10-04 05:33

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

there are some parts of the text than need to be addressed by the authors : There are a lot of words not correctly joined (be careful editing the text) the authors should add more information in certain areas of this report : Methods : It is important the authors point out if the procedure of rendez vous was carried out in patients with a previously gastrostomy(PEG)-tube or if it would be possible to do in patients "The Procedure characteristics:" should be included in Methods not in Results Results: "The Procedure characteristics:" "... The retrograde puncture of the obstruction was achieved with a VisiGlide guidewire (Olympus, Tokyo, Japan) in four of six cases" what did happen with the others two? the authors should explain better the way of puncturing the distal end of the esophago ; please add tips and tricks of the procedureAfter the first intervention, nasogastric tubes were inserted in all cases to keep the dilated obstruction open. ... only after the first intervention? ,or after every intervention before it was reached an established diameter? ,please add some more comments Swallowing success: This paragraph should be improved, because it is difficult to understand. please summarize this results and try to make them easy to understand.



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

"....three of four patients had relevant improvement of swallowing (\geq Level 3), and two of thoseOne patient was PEG-tube dependent with minimal attempts of food or liquid (FOIS Level 2)". For instance my summary would be: 3 clinical successes with a FOIS score more than 6, 2 pts dying before the authors could draw any conclusion during the follow up, and one pts with a poor result with a FOIS score of 2 Discussion: ...A correlation has been described between radiation stricture induction and radiation dose, as well as volume[18]. volume of what? "...The most difficult part of the antegrade-retrograde rendezvous procedure is to gain access through the completely obstructed oesophagus.." This part should be better commented and explained in the Discussion and also in the Methods .."we started all punctures with guide wires (0.035 inch).." where and how do you puncture?

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 22716

Title: Endoscopic Dilation of Complete Oesophageal Obstructions with a Combined Antegrade-Retrograde Rendezvous Technique

Reviewer's code: 00504182

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2015-09-17 11:07

Date reviewed: 2015-10-09 02:09

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Good paper with interesting case report. It is well written and organized.