

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Manuscript NO: 33463

Title: Successful endoscopic removal of three embedded esophageal self-expanding metal stents

Reviewer's code: 02953383

Reviewer's country: Taiwan

Science editor: Jin-Xin Kong

Date sent for review: 2017-02-14

Date reviewed: 2017-02-16

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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors reported a case of refractory benign esophageal strictures with three stent embedded in the esophagus and successfully treated with a sten-in-stent technique. The case is interesting and the case report is well-written with nice picture demonstration and therefore is worth to share with the readers who care or treat such patients. The reviewer only has a few minor suggestions. 1. The patient has undergone a radical resection of esophageal cancer as the authors described. Please clarify the actual location of esophageal cancer, operation method and the surgical resection extent. 2. Since the first stent is placed for fistula, why it was not removed months later when the fistula was presumed to get healed? Which location was the benign stricture after the first stent and when were the 2nd and 3rd stents placed? 3. Line 9 of case report: what is barium "metal" examination? Typo? 4. Figure legend for figure 3c and 3d were a little confusing. Figure 3c looks like a widen stricture with stent in situ and 3d showed a removed stent.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Manuscript NO: 33463

Title: Successful endoscopic removal of three embedded esophageal self-expanding metal stents

Reviewer's code: 03478404

Reviewer's country: Romania

Science editor: Jin-Xin Kong

Date sent for review: 2017-04-28

Date reviewed: 2017-05-01

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

This case report appears very interesting, the authors demonstrated wonderful skills, the paper is nicely written, the pictures are of high quality and references pertinent. It truly deserves to be published in this journal. Congratulations to the authors! I would, however, suggest some minor details to be clarified: 1. The authors could mention where the location of the esophageal cancer was and how long the resected part of the esophagus was. How was the anastomosis performed? 2. When were the second and third partially covered SEMSs placed? In the "Discussion" paragraph it is mentioned that "three SEMSs remained in place for over a year". But this should be mentioned also in the CASE REPORT. 2'. Where was this benign esophageal stricture located, since in the "Discussion" paragraph the authors mention that "with the successive placement of the stents, the esophageal stricture moved upward". We only know that the actual stricture described in the paper was situated 25 cm from the upper incisors. 3. What does "barium metal examination" mean? It was mentioned both in the CASE REPORT and



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

the Figure 1 legend. 4. In the text, Fig 2a corresponds to the “embedded stent”, which I cannot see. In the Figure legend, Fig 2a corresponds to the stricture. 5. Fig 3c shows the wider stricture, but in the figure legend is mentioned 3d. Fig 3d shows the removed stent.