

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 13619

**Title:** Management strategies to orthotopic liver transplantation anastomotic biliary stricture - a review of the literature and results from a tertiary hospital

**Reviewer's code:** 02444931

**Reviewer's country:** China

**Science editor:** Yue-Li Tian

**Date sent for review:** 2014-08-28 19:36

**Date reviewed:** 2014-09-10 10:13

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Minor points: 1.cSEMS, namely Covered self-expandable metal stents, should not be firstly appeared with abbreviation in the Abstract. 2.Section of Results seems to be confused. Authors should express it with more clear and logics.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 13619

**Title:** Management strategies to orthotopic liver transplantation anastomotic biliary stricture - a review of the literature and results from a tertiary hospital

**Reviewer's code:** 01799429

**Reviewer's country:** Japan

**Science editor:** Yue-Li Tian

**Date sent for review:** 2014-08-28 19:36

**Date reviewed:** 2014-09-10 17:09

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors described management strategies for anastomotic biliary stricture after orthotopic liver transplantation. Comparison between cSEMS and plastic stent was the main issue of this paper, but study design was non-randomized retrospective one. Major points 1. Please clarify how to choose stent type for each case? 2. Follow-up intervals of two groups were different, therefore it could influence some outcomes. Please describe this point as limitation of this study. 3. I supposed that this paper was not review but original article, but their conclusion was based half on the result of literature review. I recommend to focus on their study results and shorten the review part.