



**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>

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 69294

Title: Percutaneous biliary stent combined with brachytherapy using 125I seeds for the treatment of unresectable malignant obstructive jaundice: A meta-analysis

Reviewer's code: 04668002

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Sweden

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-06-24

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-06-25 05:12

Reviewer performed review: 2021-06-25 05:42

Review time: 1 Hour

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 Grade E: Do not publish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 type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Point 01 The review was not registered in a register for systematic review, such as PROSPERO. Point 02 The search for eligible papers has to be updated. The last one was performed one year ago. Point 03 Many of the results of the review are based on forest plots consisting of very few studies. I can see forest plots with 5, or even 3 or 2 studies. One cannot draw strong conclusions as the authors did with such low level of evidence.