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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
The article is within the scope of the journal, and deals with a topic of interest. However, the item can’t be accepted in the current state: a) A sufficiently detailed state of the question should be included to contextualize the experience described. b) The content should be organized into sections to clearly indicate the materials and methods used, and the results obtained. In other words, the index of the article should be: Introduction, State of the art, Materials, Methods, Results, Discussion, and Conclusions and future work. c) A section on conclusions and future work should also be included. d) Finally, the discussion section should show more clearly what the contributions of the experience described are compared to other similar studies.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
Comments: I should congratulate the authors for the very valuable and rare case. Why the patient was admitted after 5 days? Due to the increase in the chest pains? Was esophagoscopy done in the ENT and not Gastroenterology and Endoscopy department? Why the first esophagoscopy failed to see the nodule that was seen by the second endoscopy? There should be some information about the type of the aortic stent! i think you have used CO2 during the endoscopy done to extract the fishbone, if so, you better mention that in the manuscript.