

Response to peer review

July 25,2018

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Manuscript NO: 40586

Title: The Economical Effect of Lumen Apposing Metal Stents for Treating Benign Foregut Strictures

Revisions made to manuscript

1. Postal code added to the addresses of authors
2. Text deleted from the abstract as instructed by editor
3. Inform consent, Institutional review board approval and conflict of interest subheadings have been updated as requested by the editor
4. Audio core tip uploaded and referenced in manuscript
5. All reference numbers where transitioned to superscript
6. Table 2 has been referenced in the text in the first paragraph of the results section
7. Article highlights section completed
8. All citations updated to include all authors and PMID
9. Citation 18 has been updated
10. Definitions added to each table and figure as requested

Responses to Peer reviewer comments

Reviewer's code: 00724450

Date reviewed: 2018-07-01

Response: This reviewer's thoughtful comments are correct about how this is not a common procedure. We have referenced the fact that this is one of the larger series in

our discussion of the paper. Plastic stents are not typically utilized in benign foregut strictures; therefore, we did not include them in the analysis.

Reviewer's code: 02455208

Date reviewed: 2018-07-04

Response: This reviewer's analysis of our work was very insightful. We are suggesting that patients with greater than three dilations are likely to have ongoing symptoms, in our cohort, there could have been cost savings if LAMS had been placed. The variation in the patients with LAMS placed limits are ability to do disease specific subgroup analysis. We hope that our work will inspire more reporting of the use of LAMS which will make systemic review and meta-analysis possible.

Reviewer's code: 02551224

Date reviewed: 2018-07-05

Response: The reviewer's comments on the emphasis of clinical outcomes is a valid point. Prospective studies in the future will be helpful in determining the optimal treatment strategy for difficult cases.

Reviewer's code: 02573214

Date reviewed: 2018-07-05

Response: This reviewer's comments are appreciated and helpful.

Reviewer's code: 01557574

Date reviewed: 2018-07-06

Response: This reviewer's comments are appreciated and helpful.

Reviewer's code: 01799104

Date reviewed: 2018-07-07

Response: This reviewer's comments are appreciated and helpful.

Reviewer's code: 00503834

Date reviewed: 2018-07-09

Response: The first and second comments by the reviewer on the wide range of diseases represented under the umbrella term of “foregut” are valid. The number of LAMS placements for benign foregut strictures is low which made comparing outcomes for each anatomical location and etiology unobtainable. The third comment by the author is the rationale for this study. We are appreciative of the detail that this reviewer included in their fourth comment on the construction of our manuscript however have elected not to adjust the manuscript.

Reviewer's code: 02444931

Date reviewed: 2018-07-13

Response: The peer review by this reviewer is very much appreciated. We agree that the side effects of LAMS should be further surveyed. We have provided data on the adverse events that patients in our study experienced and hope further studies can shed light on the disadvantages of LAMS.