

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 85305

**Title:** Stent fracture after transjugular intrahepatic portosystemic shunt placement using the bare metal stent/stent-graft combination technique: a retrospective cohort study

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05424290

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MBBS, MD

**Professional title:** Academic Research, Doctor, Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-05-18

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-05-25 01:54

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-06-02 11:15

**Review time:** 8 Days and 9 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <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 <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 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 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

Authors have evaluated data for TIPS stent fracture. Though bare metal stents are uncommon these days. The data is interesting to report. The manuscript has been written well.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 85305

**Title:** Stent fracture after transjugular intrahepatic portosystemic shunt placement using the bare metal stent/stent-graft combination technique: a retrospective cohort study

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 00038995

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** FAASLD, MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Adjunct Professor, Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** United States

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-05-18

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

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-07-19 18:36

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-07-26 15:16

**Review time:** 6 Days and 20 Hours

Scientific quality	<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
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input checked="" 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) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input checked="" 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

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors did a retrospective review of bare metal TIPS stents over a 10 years period with a specific emphasis on stent fractures. They identified 7 patients out of 68 (10.3%), subcategorize these in 3 groups and submit these data to extensive statistical analysis.

This reviewer appreciates the efforts of the authors but is less convinced about the usefulness of detailed retrospective statistical data analysis from of a single center, a very limited number of cases and of stent types that are increasingly replaced by better types. The help current TIPS placers may obtain from this would appear to be limited short of some practical considerations that certainly could be beneficial. The analysis does not really provide evidence based recommendations

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 85305

**Title:** Stent fracture after transjugular intrahepatic portosystemic shunt placement using the bare metal stent/stent-graft combination technique: a retrospective cohort study

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 00227375

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Doctor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-05-18

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

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-08-01 10:49

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-08-02 11:32

**Review time:** 1 Day

Scientific quality	<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
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<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

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting manuscript about the risk factors of stent fracture after transjugular intrahepatic portosystemic shunt placement using the bare metal stent/stent-graft combination technique. The data demonstrated that the number of implanted stents and stent binding angle at the IVC end were predictors of stent fracture. The authors have suggested that the incidence of stent fracture could potentially be reduced by procedural modifications. This manuscript is nicely structured. However, the primary criticism of this manuscript is a lack of accuracy for data, especially patient characteristics. Please consider the following comment. (Comment) 1. Page 10, Table 1, Patient characteristics The number of patients is 61 in the integrity group. However, as for sex, the total number of patients is 58 ( $38 + 20 = 58$ ) in the integrity group. In addition, as for, age, Child-Pugh classification, stent number, and reoperation, the total number of patients is 68 in the integrity group. Is the one or the other correct? 2. Page 7, Patient characteristics, lines 8-9 "A total 151 stents were implanted, with an average of 2.2 stents implanted in each patient (range: 2-4)." The data (Table 1) shows that 169 stents ( $2 \times 55 + 2 \times 4 + 3 \times 11 + 3 \times 2 + 4 \times 2 + 4 \times 1 = 169$ ) were implanted. Is the one or the other correct?

Sorry if I have got it wrong. Please consider. 3. Page 6, Statistical analysis, lines 9-10  
The authors described that the model was adjusted for covariates found to be significant  
in univariate analysis. A covariate found to be statistically significant is only angle 2 in  
Table 1. Which kind of covariates except “angle 2” is selected in multivariate analysis? I  
think the authors should make it clear.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 85305

**Title:** Stent fracture after transjugular intrahepatic portosystemic shunt placement using the bare metal stent/stent-graft combination technique: a retrospective cohort study

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 02441274

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** FACG, FASGE, MD

**Professional title:** Adjunct Professor, Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-05-18

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

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-08-01 11:57

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-08-08 06:42

**Review time:** 6 Days and 18 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



<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 <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 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 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

The authors explore a rather uncommon entity of stent fracture post TIPSS as a retrospective cohort study although the technique has been replaced at most centres. The subject being rare is of interest and the manuscript is well written. Overall Decision: Accept with minor revision    Comments for improvement prior to acceptance    1.

Abstract: Aim: Remove “The incidence.....unknown” 2. Abstract :  
Background: “only a few literature” to change “with limited available literature” 3.

Abstract: Methods: Remove “Chinese Medical Centre” 4. Results: In the predictor analysis was post procedure PSG accounted for as one of the predictors? 5. Please provide detailed univariate and multivariate parameters and adjustment co-variates in Table 3 to provide a more comprehensive table