

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 67958

**Title:** New anti-reflux plastic stent to reduce the risk of stent-related cholangitis in the treatment of biliary strictures

**Reviewer's code:** 01430761

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-05-07

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-05-07 14:01

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-05-08 08:33

**Review time:** 18 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<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 checked="" 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



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

This is a retrospective study of anti-reflux and conventional plastic stents for both malignant and benign biliary obstructions. 1.The authors previously published a RCT and demonstrated superiority of this anti-reflux stent. This RCT cohort was also included in this retrospective study. However, the evidence level of the previous RCT is higher than this retrospective study. The authors may want to focus on benign biliary strictures, or add additional analysis to explore subgroups who would benefit best from anti-reflux plastic stents. 2.I am somewhat confused by stent patency and stent-related cholangitis. In general, patients with cholangitis have stent occlusion or vice versa when plastic stents are placed. Why those Kaplan-Meier curves are so different between stent patency and stent-related cholangitis? 3. How was the durability of anti-reflux valve? Was the valve still intact at the time of reinterventions? 4. More than half of patients were excluded from the analysis, especially because of plastic stents other than 10Fr. This should inevitably cause selection bias. Although the authors claimed there were no significant statistical differences between two groups, the authors may want to perform propensity score match analysis.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 67958

**Title:** New anti-reflux plastic stent to reduce the risk of stent-related cholangitis in the treatment of biliary strictures

**Reviewer's code:** 03883893

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor, Doctor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-05-07

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-05-09 05:17

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-05-09 08:35

**Review time:** 3 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<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 checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

As a sequel to their preliminaries study, the authors are trying to clarify the usefulness of the new anti-reflux plastic stent in a larger number of cases. I think this stent is very promising and interesting. However, I think that there are major problems with the definition and the method of case accumulation.

1. This study is reported to be included 172 cases, but it is actually a review of 172 ERCP procedures in 133 patients. This content is only listed in Table 1 and is very difficult to understand. I think the results of the first stent alone in 133 patients should be described, because the second stent may have a shorter time to recurrent biliary obstruction due to debris.
2. You should describe how many times each stent exchange was performed on how many patients. Did any patients be inserted a different stent for the first and second stent? Please state clearly.
3. I think that the definition of "Stent-related cholangitis" and "Stent dysfunction" are not clearly distinguished. Please refer to the following paper to make a clear distinction. Isayama H, Hamada T, Yasuda I, et al. TOKYO criteria 2014 for transpapillary biliary stenting. Digestive Endoscopy 2015; 27: 259-264
4. For "Stent patency", I think it is enough to state the cumulative median calculated by Kaplan-Meier method and its comparison. I think "There were no  $\sim$ ( $P=0.084$ ) between the two groups." in the "Stent patency" section is unnecessary. Delete them, leaving only the results you consider necessary.
5. Figure 4; Please list the number of cases for the entire group, not the censored number. And all Kaplan-Meier curves should be marked with the number at risk (Figure 4 and Figure 5).

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 67958

**Title:** New anti-reflux plastic stent to reduce the risk of stent-related cholangitis in the treatment of biliary strictures

**Reviewer's code:** 00503834

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor, Attending Doctor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-05-07

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-05-10 02:39

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-05-13 15:39

**Review time:** 3 Days and 12 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>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 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



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Standardization of stent size, 10Fr, was not enough to be a excellent paper.

## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 67958

**Title:** New anti-reflux plastic stent to reduce the risk of stent-related cholangitis in the treatment of biliary strictures

**Reviewer's code:** 03883893

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor, Doctor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-05-07

**Reviewer chosen by:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-06-15 11:35

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-06-16 10:34

**Review time:** 22 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](http://www.wjgnet.com)

I was satisfied with all the replies. Thank you for your sincere reply.