



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 84567

**Title:** Comparison of trans-gastric versus trans-enteric (trans-duodenal or trans-jejunal) endoscopic ultrasound guided gallbladder drainage (EUS\_GBD) using lumen apposing metal stents (LAMS)

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 02445477

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** FACS, MS

**Professional title:** Chief Doctor, Surgeon

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

**Author's Country/Territory:** United States

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-03-20

**Reviewer chosen by:** Geng-Long Liu

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-05-13 16:29

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-05-26 15:06

**Review time:** 12 Days and 22 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Novelty of this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty



<b>Creativity or innovation of this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation
<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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**

Abstract is shaggy, no concise information on manuscript. Abstract is too long This is misinformation "Endoscopic ultrasound guided gallbladder drainage (EUS-GBD) is being increasingly used in practice as a bridge to cholecystectomy" Introduction is undergraduate information,nothing on the significance of topic Aims needs to be revisted, authors have meagre information on Aims in Meta-analysis. Methodolgy , study design is not standard ? Type of statistics used ? Result section is not as per aims , more compex statistical data Discussion needs to be result oriented. Referencs needs to uniform pattern Conclusion is not of yours , you are having references in these and their conclusion



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 84567

**Title:** Comparison of trans-gastric versus trans-enteric (trans-duodenal or trans-jejunal) endoscopic ultrasound guided gallbladder drainage (EUS\_GBD) using lumen apposing metal stents (LAMS)

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05455405

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor, Surgeon, Surgical Oncologist

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

**Author's Country/Territory:** United States

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-03-20

**Reviewer chosen by:** Geng-Long Liu

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-06-03 06:56

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-06-07 17:08

**Review time:** 4 Days and 10 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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
<b>Novelty of this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty



# 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

<b>Creativity or innovation of this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation
<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<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 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 statements</b>	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

Dear editors! The topic is interesting, because reflects a slightly non-standard view of the described problem for the drainage of the gallbladder. Technically, the manuscript contains the necessary data when writing systematic reviews and meta-analyses. It is required to strengthen the relevance of the topic in the Introduction section. The data and the results obtained require minor correction. Discussion - requires supplementing with information about the advantages and disadvantages of the analyzed methods of drainage with stents.



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

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

**Manuscript NO:** 84567

**Title:** Comparison of trans-gastric versus trans-enteric (trans-duodenal or trans-jejunal) endoscopic ultrasound guided gallbladder drainage (EUS\_GBD) using lumen apposing metal stents (LAMS)

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer’s code:** 02954106

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer’s Country/Territory:** Spain

**Author’s Country/Territory:** United States

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-03-20

**Reviewer chosen by:** Geng-Long Liu

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-06-09 12:04

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-06-16 08:54

**Review time:** 6 Days and 20 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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
<b>Novelty of this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty



<b>Creativity or innovation of this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation
<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<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 statements</b>	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**

The authors propose a very interesting meta-analysis on EUS-guided drainage of the gallbladder. The comparison of the drainage insertion site (transgastric vs. transduodenal) is a new and very interesting aspect for endoscopists who perform this type of procedure. The general "feeling" of endoscopists is that transgastric drainage is technically easier but clinically worse. The study is clear and concise, the statistics are correct and it provides interesting information for clinical practice. Regarding the concept of using the "hot" or "cold" device, the results of the study confirm an obvious aspect: if the procedure is simpler and has fewer steps, the result will have fewer side effects.