

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Gastroenterology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRRGA_116666
Title of the Manuscript:	Endoscopic Extraction of Foreign Bodies from The Upper Digestive Tract in Adults – A Case Study
Type of the Article	Case study

### General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajrrga.com/index.php/AJRRGA/editorial-policy>)

### PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. Yes, it is important for scientific community to collect data about common problems like FBs ingestion to verify causes and proper plans of management and to improve the quality of services delivered to the patients.</p> <p>2. No, it is better to be a cases series study instead of a case study.</p> <p>3. Yes.</p> <p>4. Yes.</p> <p>5. Yes.</p> <p>6. References are sufficient but the first reference used in the introduction is too old since 2001 also the forth reference is too old since 2001.</p> <p>In the abstract the division of location of FBs is inaccurate (half of them in the oesophagus which means 50% +29% in the stomach + 3.2% in the duodenum + 17.7 % not found =99.9%) so there is missing data. In methodology 36 of patients underwent standard x-ray, you should clarify your investigations and their indications for example why you investigate a patient with standard chest x-ray while investigating another patient with CT chest. You should clarify the reference for your conclusion.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Yes.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Mohammed Ahmed El-Gelany Azab</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Cairo University Kasr Alainy School of Medicine, Egypt</b>