

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 58133

Title: letter to the editor about a comment on “Updated meta-analysis of pancreatic stent placement in preventing post-endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography pancreatitis”

Reviewer's code: 03722267

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MS

Professional title: President

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-07-10

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-07-10 03:23

Reviewer performed review: 2020-07-10 07:45

Review time: 4 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

As the authors pointed out, data extraction errors exist in a published article titled, "Updated meta-analysis of pancreatic stent placement in preventing post-endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography pancreatitis". The investigators should provide an accurate information after correcting the data extraction errors.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 58133

Title: letter to the editor about a comment on “Updated meta-analysis of pancreatic stent placement in preventing post-endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography pancreatitis”

Reviewer's code: 00503431

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PharmD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Iran

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-07-10

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-07-10 08:04

Reviewer performed review: 2020-07-11 12:48

Review time: 1 Day and 4 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This manuscript aimed at noting to data extraction issues of the recently published article titled "Updated meta-analysis of pancreatic stent placement in preventing post-endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography pancreatitis." At first, I thank the authors for their valuable attention on finding these essential errors but after hearing the explanation of original paper authors and understand the clarification. Considering their first comment, by repeating the methodology, I reached the same problems which the authors mentioned in the current letter. Namely, in Table 1 of the meta-analysis, the authors of meta-analysis repeated one study twice with the same reference but different data. This is while, in Table 2, this issue was addressed. So, it seems that they mistakenly wrote it twice but needs to be explained. I also reviewed all references cited in the repeated study (Tarnasky et al.-Reference number 12) to see if there is any related research; however, I couldn't find anything. Considering the second comment, the authors of the current letter did not sufficiently explain the problems related to inconsistencies between Table 1 and Figure 1(A). Therefore, I kindly ask the authors to more precisely elucidate what the problem is. For instance, they can bring about the correct information of the problematic cited studies in this Figure, and explain how they differ from which the authors of the meta-analysis wrote in their article. Except for which the authors mentioned in this letter, I found out that such inconsistencies also exist between Table 1 and Figure 1(B) of the meta-analysis. So, I ask the authors to please add this comment to the letter, as well. Please correct the following language/general problems: 1. Please change "was" to "were" in this sentence: "Two of the 15 studies were labeled with the same reference, but the extracted data was different." 2. Please change "differs" to "differ" in the caption of Fig.1: "The two underlined studies are labeled with



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

the same reference, but the extracted data differs." 3. Please change "in" to "of" in the caption of Fig.1: "Citation in the Figure." 4. Please change "tables" to "Table 1" in the caption of Fig.2. Also, please add "in the Figure.2A" after the word meta-analysis in this sentence: "The highlighted data show inconsistent characteristics in the tables describing the included studies and the meta-analysis." 5. Please add the cited reference for Fig.2 as which it was done for Fig.1. 6. Please remove apostrophe s in investigators': "we thank the investigators' efforts" 7. It's better to add all references related to current problems in this meta-analysis to help readers more easily find out the issues. Put differently, please add the references related to highlighted studies in Fig.2 of this letter.