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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
The authors have presented a review on Candy Cane syndrome. I have following comments regarding the manuscript: 1. Please combine figures 1 and 2. Also mark the dilated jejunal loop with arrow. 2. Please mention what is the appropriate length of the blind loop to prevent Candy Cane syndrome. 3. Please discuss the endoscopic treatment for Candy Cane syndrome in detail. 4. Please discuss the possible preoperative differential diagnosis for Candy cane syndrome. 5. The authors can provide their personal inputs in the diagnosis and treatment of this rare syndrome if any for the benefit of the readers.
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**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

It is a good trial to write a review about this subject but the aim is not presented as written in the paper. The abstract is accepted. The introduction is adequate yet not fully covering the CSS methods. Clearly stated results are also presented but not optimal. Discussion needs more clarification and highlight the debates in management. References accepted.