

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-50621

Date: 13/03/25

Title: AN UNUSUAL FOREIGN BODY IN OESOPHAGUS.

Recommendation:

Accept as it isYes.....

Accept after minor revision.....

Accept after major revision

Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality	•			
Techn. Quality	•			
Clarity	•			
Significance	•			

Reviewer Name: Dr. Sireesha Kuruganti

Date: 13/03/25

Reviewer's Comment for Publication.

(To be published with the manuscript in the journal)

The reviewer is requested to provide a brief comment (3-4 lines) highlighting the significance, strengths, or key insights of the manuscript. This comment will be Displayed in the journal publication alongside with the reviewers name.

The manuscript is well-written and provides a comprehensive account of an unusual case of a foreign body in the oesophagus.

.....

.....

.....

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Abstract

The abstract is concise and provides a brief overview of the case report. It clearly mentions the nature of the foreign body, the challenges faced during endoscopic retrieval, and the ultimate success of the open

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

approach (Lines 6-11). Consider adding more details about the patient's condition and the complications encountered.

Introduction

The introduction provides a good background on the frequency and types of oesophageal foreign bodies (Lines 14-19). However, the citation format could be improved for better readability. For example, "Foreign bodies in the oesophagus are twice as common as bronchial foreign bodies (1)" instead of "Foreign bodies in the oesophagus are twice common than bronchial foreign bodies (1)" (Lines 14-15).

The explanation of life-threatening complications and management factors is well-presented (Lines 20-28). Ensure all references are correctly formatted.

Case Report

The case report is detailed and thorough. It starts with the patient's background and the initial attempts at retrieval (Lines 38-45). The description of the CT scan findings and the surgical procedure is clear and well-structured (Lines 46-63).

The inclusion of images (Figures 1 and 2) is useful for understanding the case better (Lines 48-52, 63-66). Ensure that all images are correctly labeled and referenced in the text.

Discussion

The discussion effectively highlights the challenges of endoscopic retrieval and the need for an open approach in certain cases (Lines 74-89). The mention of complications associated with endoscopic retrieval adds depth to the discussion (Lines 91-97).

The discussion could benefit from comparing this case with similar cases reported in the literature. This would provide a broader context and highlight the uniqueness of the case.

Declarations

The declarations section is complete, with no conflicts of interest, financial interest, or need for ethical approval (Lines 105-111).

References

Ensure that all references are cited correctly within the text and follow the journal's citation style (Lines 113-175).

Minor improvements in citation formatting and additional context in the discussion section would enhance the manuscript further.