

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

Manuscript NO: 84127

Title: Comparison of the efficacy of different percutaneous transhepatic biliary stent placement and catheter drainage in the treatment of middle and low malignant biliary obstruction

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06143380

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor, Research Dean

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Germany

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-03-13

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-03-20 02:17

Reviewer performed review: 2023-03-21 09:38

Review time: 1 Day 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 <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 Grade E: Do not publish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 <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 <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation
Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<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
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<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
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	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

A total of 424 patients with middle and low biliary obstruction who underwent percutaneous liver puncture biliary stent placement and catheter drainage from March 2016 to March 2022 were retrospectively analyzed in this study. The study is set up correctly. The results showed that the clinical efficacy of percutaneous left liver puncture is better than that of percutaneous right liver puncture. The article is informative and well presentation. This topic is actual and well described. The Results are presented clearly and have been discussed well. The figures show in detail the left/right hepatic ducts with percutaneous stent implantation and catheter drainage. Comments 1: Background descriptions of the article can be richer and could be added two different puncture paths in the treatment of middle and low biliary obstruction More current clinical applications. In addition, the ABSTRACT also needs to briefly introduce the background data of this study. Comments 2: Some confusion is described in the Results

section. I recommend that this be described in subsections, such as the basic data of all patients, the comparison of clinical efficacy between the two groups, and the comparison of safety (occurrence of adverse events).

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

Manuscript NO: 84127

Title: Comparison of the efficacy of different percutaneous transhepatic biliary stent placement and catheter drainage in the treatment of middle and low malignant biliary obstruction

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06143352

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-03-13

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-03-14 09:00

Reviewer performed review: 2023-03-21 09:44

Review time: 7 Days

Scientific quality	<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
Novelty of this manuscript	<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

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 <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation
Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<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
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<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
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	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

I think the description in the summary section "All 424 cases were successfully operated without adverse events." is incorrect. Adverse events are defined as abnormalities in any clinical examination value and all diseases that occurred during the study. Does any patient have no adverse events? According to the text description, there should be no serious adverse events (death, serious cardiac and cerebrovascular accidents, etc.). In addition, the article describes intervention operation in detail and the authors do well. Data in the tables are very good, and well discussed. Thank you for giving opportunity to review your study.