

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 53489

**Title:** Newly Developed Self-Expandable Niti-S MD Colonic Metal Stent for Malignant Colonic Obstruction

**Reviewer's code:** 04022672

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's country:** Japan

**Author's country:** Japan

**Manuscript submission date:** 2019-12-21

**Reviewer chosen by:** Ruo-Yu Ma

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-01-05 07:42

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-01-09 02:33

**Review time:** 3 Days and 18 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**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

## **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

The authors present results of a new SEMS for obstructive colonic cancer patients. The manuscript itself is well written. The reviewer has the following questions/comments.

1. In methods, authors state that " The inclusion criteria for colonic SEMS placement were as follows: patients presenting with acute colonic obstruction and radiological features (as observed by computed tomography) consistent with a carcinoma." As the results, technical success rate was 100%. Were there any cases with the other treatment such as decompression tube or trans-nasal tube? And was there no case with impossibility of contrast imaging of the oral bowel or with failure of guidewire insertion for bulky tumor and complete obstruction? 2. This study includes cases of SEMS insertion for BTS and palliative purposes together. Do the authors have results according to the each purpose?

## **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

### ***Google Search:***

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ [ Y ] No

### ***BPG Search:***

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ [ Y ] No