

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy* 

Manuscript NO: 80924

**Title:** Endoscopic Biliary Treatment of Unresectable Cholangiocarcinoma: A Meta-Analysis of Survival Outcomes and Systematic Review

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03597656

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Iran

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2022-11-03

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-11-04 05:44

Reviewer performed review: 2022-11-07 04:42

Review time: 2 Days and 22 Hours

Scientific quality	[Y] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[Y] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No



Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [ ] Anonymous [Y] Onymous
statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript is well-written and the study design is good, but there are some issues that should be addressed before publication as follows: Major issues: For systematic search, why did only the authors perform their search in the PubMed database and other relevant databases not considered? Minor issues: In the abstract, in METHODS the time limit for performing the systematic search should be added. In Quality Assessment of Included Studies, 'To better assess the quality of individual studies, we used the Newcastle-Ottawa scale (NOS) for retrospective case-control studies and the Cochrane tool for risk of bias for randomized controlled trials' please add the following references for these sentences: (10.1002/jcsm.13043; 10.1002/jmv.27996). In Statistical Analysis, 'Between-study heterogeneity was reported with the I2 statistic with values greater than 50 suggestive of substantial heterogeneity.' please add the following references for these sentences: (10.1016/j.physio.2021.04.005; 10.1093/ptj/pzab144).



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy* 

Manuscript NO: 80924

**Title:** Endoscopic Biliary Treatment of Unresectable Cholangiocarcinoma: A Meta-Analysis of Survival Outcomes and Systematic Review

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06061829

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Greece

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2022-11-03

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-12-01 09:05

Reviewer performed review: 2022-12-02 11:01

**Review time:** 1 Day and 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<ul> <li>[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing</li> <li>[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection</li> </ul>
Conclusion	<ul> <li>[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority)</li> <li>[ Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection</li> </ul>
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No



Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous
statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. Please provide a data availability statement if it is applicable. 2. Please clarify why other search engines were not used (like Medline, Ovid journals, EMBASE, etc.).