

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Manuscript NO: 47071

Title: Should a fully covered self-expandable biliary metal stent be anchored with a double-pigtail plastic stent? A retrospective study

Reviewer's code: 02551224

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Ying Dou

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-03-08 14:33

Reviewer performed review: 2019-03-08 16:03

Review time: 1 Hour

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Authors, The manuscript entitled "Should a Covered Self-Expandable Biliary Metal Stent be Anchored with a Double-Pigtail Plastic Stent? A retrospective Study" aims to answer this question by analyzing the differences in migration rate between two groups



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

of patients, in which fully covered self-expandable metal stents (FCSEMSs) were used alone or in combination with double-pigtail plastic stents (DPS), to prevent migration. The conclusion was that there was no difference in migration rate between the two groups. In this retrospective analysis uncovered stents were excluded, as well as plastic stents. I think it would have been useful to know also the migration rate of uncovered stents, for comparison. Anyway, with the limits of the retrospective nature and the lack of randomization, this study is of some interest for gastroenterologists performing these procedures, and I think it deserves publication.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☒ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☒ No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Manuscript NO: 47071

Title: Should a fully covered self-expandable biliary metal stent be anchored with a double-pigtail plastic stent? A retrospective study

Reviewer's code: 02573214

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Ying Dou

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-03-08 05:37

Reviewer performed review: 2019-03-11 09:11

Review time: 3 Days and 3 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors report the migration rate after fully covered self-expandable biliary metal stent with or without a double-pigtail plastic stent. The work, which is a retrospective study, considers too many variables (neoplastic stenosis, benign stenosis, bile leaks,



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

post-sphincterotomy bleeding). The series is limited. The results of the comparison between FCSEMSs alone vs FCSEMSs with a Double-Pigtail Plastic Sten are generic and not related to the variables taken into consideration.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Manuscript NO: 47071

Title: Should a fully covered self-expandable biliary metal stent be anchored with a double-pigtail plastic stent? A retrospective study

Reviewer's code: 02551508

Reviewer's country: Turkey

Science editor: Ying Dou

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-03-08 09:45

Reviewer performed review: 2019-03-12 13:44

Review time: 4 Days and 3 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you for submitting a manuscript to the journal. Please add description of the anti-migration technique to the method section

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Manuscript NO: 47071

Title: Should a fully covered self-expandable biliary metal stent be anchored with a double-pigtail plastic stent? A retrospective study

Reviewer's code: 01557574

Reviewer's country: Turkey

Science editor: Ying Dou

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-03-08 06:23

Reviewer performed review: 2019-03-22 06:43

Review time: 14 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Authors, This manuscript titled "Should a Fully Covered Self-Expandable Biliary Metal Stent be Anchored with a Double-Pigtail Plastic Stent? A Retrospective Study" should be published at WJG. There is no new informations but it is well

documented. Sincerely yours.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Manuscript NO: 47071

Title: Should a fully covered self-expandable biliary metal stent be anchored with a double-pigtail plastic stent? A retrospective study

Reviewer's code: 00038617

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Ying Dou

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-03-10 14:23

Reviewer performed review: 2019-03-24 09:06

Review time: 13 Days and 18 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors conducted a retrospective study, in single center setting, to examine the factors associated with increased risk of stent migration in patients who underwent FCSEMS placement. According to their results, overall migration rate was 9.7%. There

was no significant association between anchoring the FCSEMSs with DPS and the risk of stent migration. The rates of benign biliary stricture and previous sphincterotomy were significantly different between patients with stent migration and patients with no stent migration. Therefore, they concluded that anchoring an FCSEMS with DPS did not decrease the risk of stent migration and routine placement of anchoring stents is unnecessary. This study has some value in clinical practice. There are several problems in this paper as it stands. I request the following revisions for publication. (1) Overall patient characteristics should be presented in Table 1, at first. Thereafter, comparison between patients with and without stent migration should be presented in Table 2. (2) In results of the abstract, the last sentence should be revised. ---a statistically significant difference in the migration rate between patients who had FCSEMS with DPS and FCSEMS alone. Is this not a mistake? (3) Figure 2-5 is not necessary in this paper.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No