



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Hepatology

**Manuscript NO:** 61382

**Title:** Endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography drainage for palliation of malignant hilar biliary obstruction—stent-in-stent or side-by-side? A systematic review and meta-analysis

**Reviewer's code:** 05106874

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** China

**Author's Country/Territory:** Brazil

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-01-13

**Reviewer chosen by:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-01-18 10:18

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-01-21 07:04

**Review time:** 2 Days and 20 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer</b>	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**

Malignant hilar biliary obstruction (MHBO) is a complicated issue in the practise of GI department. SIS and SBS are two kinds of ERCP treatments of this problem. Each ona has its own features. After searching and analyzing several literatures, the authors found that compare to SBS, SIS showed superiority in stent patency. It is a very important clue while GI doctors chosing one strategy in the management of MHBO. But, we also notice that there is still very few documents focus in this field. So, RCT study need to performed in the near future in order to make this conclusion more solid.



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Hepatology

**Manuscript NO:** 61382

**Title:** Endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography drainage for palliation of malignant hilar biliary obstruction—stent-in-stent or side-by-side? A systematic review and meta-analysis

**Reviewer's code:** 03666496

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD, MSc, PhD

**Professional title:** Doctor, Research Fellow

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Australia

**Author's Country/Territory:** Brazil

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-01-13

**Reviewer chosen by:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-01-18 06:24

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-01-24 01:15

**Review time:** 5 Days and 18 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer</b>	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" 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: [ Y ] Yes [ ] No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors present a meta-analysis on 3 observational studies and 1 RCT (summed to 226 patients) that compared stent-in-stent (SIS) versus side-by-side (SBS) techniques for malignant hilar biliary obstruction (MHBO). The outcomes analysed were efficacy (e.g. technical and clinical success) and safety (e.g. procedure-related mortality). This is an interesting study on a rare entity (i.e. endoscopic palliation of MHBO), which is well suited for a meta-analysis. The study has been well conducted respecting all the important steps for a systematic review and meta-analysis and provides the current literature new information. Nevertheless, the manuscript has a few parts that might appear unclear to a non-specialist reader in addition to some typos. Therefore, I would like to offer some constructive criticism through the following: 1 - Even through the authors describe their search strategy had no restrictions regarding language, my understanding is that utilising terms in English for the search strategy inherently excludes papers which do not have at least an abstract in English. Even though this does not happen often, this could happen. I strongly suggest that the authors rectify their statement to account for this (e.g. as per the search strategy, this meta-analysis was restricted to studies that had at least the abstract in English). 2 - Suggest clearly stating in the abstract (methods section) the comparisons (e.g. SIS vs SBS through ERCP). 3 - Please elaborate and specify what the authors have considered to be a "suitable quality" study (page 6, Eligibility criteria). Was an objective criteria used to exclude low quality studies, or was the quality of studies assessed but not used as inclusion/exclusion criteria? 4 - Abstract: please correct typos (i.e. RTC instead of RCT; included instead of included) 5 - Abstract: please include the unit for the patency outcome (i.e. days); also would suggest not using the abbreviated form of mean deviation in the abstract 6 -



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA

**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568

**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)

**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](https://www.wjgnet.com)

Although implicit, it would be useful to state in the inclusion criteria that only metallic stents are being look at, (e.g. SBS plastic stents versus SIS metallic stents)