

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

**Manuscript NO:** 86090

**Title:** Pitfalls and promises of bile duct alternatives: There is plenty of room in the regenerative surgery

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05247020

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Doctor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-05-31

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

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-06-20 06:46

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-06-22 13:48

**Review time:** 2 Days and 7 Hours

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Scientific quality                          | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good<br><input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish |
| Novelty of this manuscript                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair<br><input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty   |
| Creativity or innovation of this manuscript | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair<br><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<br><input 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)<br><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

The authors submitted a letter to the editor discussing the challenges and potential solutions in creating bile duct substitutes for biliary reconstruction in abdominal surgery. Research and development of artificial biliary substitutes is an indispensable part of modern biliary surgery, bearing great clinical significance on the recovery of the normal functions of the biliary system. Although research has been conducted for over 100 years to directly repair bile duct defects with alternatives, no bile duct substitute has been developed. The implantation of artificial biliary substitutes may cause the blockage or stenosis of the biliary duct at the transplantation site, which is the most urgent problem in the research of artificial biliary substitutes. The authors suggest that a systematic analysis of factors leading to success or failure in creating bile duct substitutes, quantitative models to estimate outcomes, and the use of endogenous regeneration abilities of the organism may help in developing more effective approaches. They emphasize the need for an interdisciplinary approach, including quantitative methods and retrospective analysis, to pave the way for bile duct restoration with physiologically relevant outcomes. Overall, this manuscript is better designed, written, and the logic

is clear. Individual English errors need to be corrected.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

**Manuscript NO:** 86090

**Title:** Pitfalls and promises of bile duct alternatives: There is plenty of room in the regenerative surgery

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05563041

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** BSc, MSc, PhD

**Professional title:** Assistant Professor, Research Fellow

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-05-31

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

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-06-21 07:07

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-06-26 04:39

**Review time:** 4 Days and 21 Hours

|                    |   |
|--------------------|---|
| Scientific quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good<br><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<br><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)<br><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   |

|                                     |   |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| <b>Peer-reviewer<br/>statements</b> | Peer-Review: [ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] Anonymous [ <input type="radio"/> ] Onymous |
|                                     | Conflicts-of-Interest: [ <input type="radio"/> ] Yes [ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] No  |

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

[In brief, my comments were related to this being a 'Letter to the Editor' style manuscript, and thus, should offer more insights and further the discussion presented in the manuscript the authors are commenting on. The abstract should not include references, the Figure has a white space that could very easily be filled by the topic the authors fail to touch on: biomaterials and tissue engineering advancements for bile duct replacements. Indeed, a discussion around this alternative route for regenerating bile duct tissues could provide 'meet-in-the-middle' approach from the surgical, physiologists, and engineers perspectives. I suggest the authors to carefully read the literature around such topics to bolster their discussion and offer further insights into strategies moving forward.]