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### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I’m honored to be invited to review the article titled Acute esophageal obstruction after ingestion of psyllium seed husk powder: A case report. In the manuscript, a case of acute esophageal obstruction caused by bezoar after ingestion of psyllium seed husk powder was reported. The case is of creative significance for the bezoar located near the gastro-esophageal junction and comorbid Parkinson’s disease, which calls for appropriate regimen in the form of treatment and health supplement. After reviewing the manuscript, I have some questions. First, for the 76-year-old patient, there is no specific description of the medication history and the severity of the fundamental disease, which makes it difficult to evaluate. Plus, it lacks the amount of psyllium seed husk powder intake and the usual medication dosage, which makes it debatable whether it can be defined as bezoar. It would be better if there is a componential analysis of the foreign body in the esophagus. More importantly, the emphasis should be put on the dosage and concentration of the medication but not a specific medication in patients with esophageal motility disorders. This case is presented just because the foreign body is made of the psyllium seed husk powder, which may not be representative and generalizable. There are also some grammar mistakes such as repeated words and some grammatical disorders, which could be polished. For the above, I suggest minor revision.
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