



ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Pharmacology and Therapeutics

ESPS manuscript NO: 18600

Title: Prevalence of eosinophilic oesophagitis in adults presenting with oesophageal food bolus obstruction

Reviewer's code: 00503587

Reviewer's country: New Zealand

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2015-04-24 20:30

Date reviewed: 2015-06-30 16:24

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 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 checked="" 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

This retrospective report focuses on patients presenting with food bolus impaction. Specific Comments 1. The manuscript does not have an ABSTRACT to assess 2. The INTRODUCTION is focused, but still requires revision to set up the reason for the work. No aim or objective is listed 3. References must be placed in standard location 4. Some comments are unreferenced and additional references should be added. 5. Specific terms (e.g. eosinophilic esophagitis) must be listed in full before abbreviations are used. 6. The METHODS are brief and inadequate. 7. The METHODS include details of results (e.g. the number of subjects etc). These should be in the RESULTS section 8. The METHODS intimate the inclusion and then immediate exclusion of children (age not defined). This seems illogical - why not just include adults initially? 9. The definition of EE is not referenced and is not a standard definition. A standard/routine definition should be utilised so that this cohort can be evaluated against other published series. 10. The RESULTS is also brief and inadequate to fully describe the features of this group. Furthermore, in the results we learn that the cohort included only a small subset with EE. 11. A third of the cohort did not have biopsies. Nor did they have any



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>

apparent endoscopic features of EE. The study would have been much more helpful if it included adult patients with FBO who had biopsies. 12. The DISCUSSION is also too brief, and has very limited discussion of the importance/relevance of the current findings in the context of the published literature. 13. Kerlin is mentioned in the DISCUSSION without any reference listed 14. The FIGURE has no title or figure legend.



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

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Pharmacology and Therapeutics

ESPS manuscript NO: 18600

Title: Prevalence of eosinophilic oesophagitis in adults presenting with oesophageal food bolus obstruction

Reviewer's code: 00072816

Reviewer's country: Sweden

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2015-04-24 20:30

Date reviewed: 2015-05-06 21:22

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"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		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

Did the patients with EO underwent any other investigation such as manometry? Maybe they had a dysmotric disorder as the cause of FBO and not only EO. I Think this is a weak paper concerning the prevalence of EO; a small Group in one hospital only. Although it is an interesting subject.