

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 24031

Title: Western view of the management of gastroesophageal foreign bodies

Reviewer's code: 00041963

Reviewer's country: Turkey

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2016-01-03 18:48

Date reviewed: 2016-01-10 20:31

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. In page 6; ?n introduction section second paragraph which starts with The type of foreing bodies could be omit 2. In page 7 teh abbrv of TC scanning should write what the meaning of TC. 3. In page 9-10-11 type of sections is too long. The authors shollud omit some paragraphs. Because the aim of the study is to explain the management of the foreing bodies. 4.In conclusion setion in page 13 personel sholud change to "hand"

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 24031

Title: Western view of the management of gastroesophageal foreign bodies

Reviewer's code: 01047575

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2016-01-03 18:48

Date reviewed: 2016-01-12 23:26

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 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

The authors selected an interesting subject, which is significant in clinics. However, some shortages were present in the manuscript. 1. Abbreviations should be explained in the first presence, such as TC scanning. 2. The authors pointed out that non-endoscopic methods are operator-dependent. However, the matters needing attention during the operation were not clarified. 3. The advantages and disadvantages of endoscopic methods and non-endoscopic methods should be compared based on reliable data, such as the cost and the incidence of morbidities. 4. There are many spelling mistakes in the manuscript. 5. The format of tables is not normative.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 24031

Title: Western view of the management of gastroesophageal foreign bodies

Reviewer's code: 02458758

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2016-01-03 18:48

Date reviewed: 2016-01-14 11:26

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

There are some suggestions for revising this manuscript. 1.The aim of artical is to discuss the difference between endoscopic methods and non-endoscopic methods of removing foreign bodies, the point should be highlighted. 2.When the first appearance of short names ,the full name and the significance should be described clearly. 3.Some spelling mistakes should be corrected. 4.Format of forms should be official.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 24031

Title: Western view of the management of gastroesophageal foreign bodies

Reviewer's code: 01799104

Reviewer's country: Taiwan

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2016-01-03 18:48

Date reviewed: 2016-01-22 15:23

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Direct endoscopic removal of foreign body in pediatric patients is a most appropriate method in countries with highly accessible medical facility. It is not only from Western view but also from other Eastern countries. The manuscript is well written. Few minor misspellings are noted. In page 7, line 5, does TC scanning mean CT scan?