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COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
Jideh et al. reported their experience of esophageal squamous papilloma (ESP) from 6962 upper gastrointestinal endoscopy cohort for 5 years. They investigated clinicopathological associations of this disease and found no clear association. Although ESP is relatively rare disease, there have been many reports with this disease and this manuscript provides no novel finding. A major problem of this study is lack of clinicopathological information of the control patients who did not have ESP. In order to clarify clinicopathologic features of EPS, clinicopathologic associations should be analyzed between patients with and without EPS.
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COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
The authors aimed to identify the prevalence of ESPs in an Australian tertiary hospital cohort and to assess for possible clinical associations and to assess its association with esophageal squamous cell carcinoma (SCC) whose large data from a total of 6962 upper gastrointestinal endoscopies though they provided no novel finding because ESP is relatively rare disease. I only had little comment.
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COMMENTS TO AUTHORS  
I have found little novel findings in this paper. It has no priority to be published.