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Reviewer’s report:

Overall, the topic chosen and data gathered by these authors would be of great value to the readership and the practitioners in the area. However, before this manuscript can be seriously considered for publication, a number of concerns should be addressed. These would include the quality of the English language, the title itself and expansion of several key areas.

In my opinion, the following comments are Major Compulsory Revisions.

First and foremost, the use of the English language throughout this manuscript is poor. Some few examples would include the following:

1) sentences that do not make any sense
   a. “In airway foreign bodies commonly lodged…” page 1, Results section, 5th sentence
   b. “The diagnosis of foreign bodies in the aerodigestive tract may be difficulty if…” page 2, Background section, 1st sentence of second paragraph
   c. page 5, line 14: ‘Plain neck/chest x-rays were radiopaque…” X-rays or even x-ray films are not radiopaque, but it is the foreign bodies themselves that may be either radiopaque or not.

2) articles missing – page 2, Background section, second paragraph, second sentence: ‘missed by experienced clinician’ should be ‘missed by an experienced clinician’

3) spelling errors: page 3, Methods section, 2nd sentence: ‘University Collage’ should be ‘University College’

4) missing apostrophe: page 2, Conclusion section, last sentence: ‘children reach’ should be ‘children’s reach’

The authors should consider a change in the title of the manuscript. With the exclusion of data for those patients with a foreign body but ‘died before endoscopic procedures’ would be vital information to gather if one is concerned about foreign bodies in the aerodigestive tract in this particular area. However, by creating this exclusion criteria, the authors are collecting data about endoscopic procedures for removal of foreign bodies and not about patients with foreign bodies. Therefore, a more appropriate title might be ‘Endoscopic procedures for
removal of foreign bodies of the aerodigestive tract: the Bugando Medical Centre experience’

Alternatively, the authors could consider collecting data about those patients that did die before endoscopic attempts at removal as well as those that did undergo an endoscopic procedure but had a normal exam with no foreign body present. These are important data for any region. Two sections should be expanded with more detail provided. One is the bottom of page 5 that mentions an overnight stay after bronchoscopy. The authors should describe why some patients were admitted and be explicit about the indications for an overnight stay. This will be useful information to other practitioners. The second area for expansion is at the end of the Discussion section where the mortality is reviewed. What was it about the inexperience that created this problem? Should a recommendation be made that only experienced endoscopists make attempts at foreign body removal? If so, how would you define or quantify that level of experience?

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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