

## ESPS Peer-review Report

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

**Ms:** 2829

**Title:** Self-expandable metallic stent placement followed by laparoscopy treating acute malignant colorectal obstruction

**Reviewer code:** 00504677

**Science editor:** s.x.gou@wjgnet.com

**Date sent for review:** 2013-03-20 08:25

**Date reviewed:** 2013-03-23 20:26

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input 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"/> Existed	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

## COMMENTS

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS:

Dear Authors: This is a retrospective study of three groups of patients, 16 patients with SEMS then laparoscopic resection 58 patients with SEMS then open resection 96 patients no SEMS but laparoscopic resection. The paper, although great efforts put in, suffer from several issues: 1. Obviously heterogeneity among these groups can not be excluded. 2. It would have worked better if only two groups of patients are compared .i.e patients with SEMS then laparoscopy versus laparoscopic excision without stent. This comparison will answer the questions of validity of preoperative SEMS, survival rate, blood loss, oncologic characteristics and outcomes and length of time of resection. 3. The study being retrospective and no independent assessor for the outcome, would carry great bias in different issues including selection and exclusion of patients and outcome assessment. 4. Standardisation: If we want to assess an outcome we should standardise the tools that produced such outcomes. Different use of type of stents and different endoscopists: it would be more helpful if single type of stent or endoscopist. 5. Several statements included and its not correct such as (introduction): Patients with left-sided colorectal cancer (CRC) always present acute colorectal obstructions (ACO) as their initial symptom. Patients with left sided colorectal cancer can present as bleeding per rectum, left sided pain, change in bowel habit, acute abdomen as perforation, etc. Obstruction is only one of presentation and not always the case as authors said. 6. Many repetition of value of minimal access approach. 7. The paper is very long and needs to be concise to the message that authors try to convey. 8. Language: grammar errors need to be



## **Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited**

Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,  
315-321 Lockhart Road,  
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

---

addressed

## ESPS Peer-review Report

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

**Ms:** 2829

**Title:** Self-expandable metallic stent placement followed by laparoscopy treating acute malignant colorectal obstruction

**Reviewer code:** 00468214

**Science editor:** s.x.gou@wjgnet.com

**Date sent for review:** 2013-03-20 08:25

**Date reviewed:** 2013-03-25 03:01

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

## COMMENTS

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS:

Congratulations for this study. My only suggestion is to analyze and discuss the use of stents in other surgeries, there is a wide use of stents in urological procedures, and some of these are self expandable, effective in relief symptoms of ureteral obstruction and easy to remove. Please (discussion section) describe better the composition materials of both stents used ( boston scientific, MicoTech) and compare it with other self expanding stents used for example in urologic surgery (allium stent Leonardo C et al. Allium stent for treatment of ureteral stenosis: first experience and preliminary results. The urologist 2012;2:1-15.)

## ESPS Peer-review Report

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

**Ms:** 2829

**Title:** Self-expandable metallic stent placement followed by laparoscopy treating acute malignant colorectal obstruction

**Reviewer code:** 00068052

**Science editor:** s.x.gou@wjgnet.com

**Date sent for review:** 2013-03-20 08:25

**Date reviewed:** 2013-03-26 18:09

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input 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"/> Existed	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

## COMMENTS

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS:

1 Please provide the number of patients who are alive at this writing in three group. 2 Please provide the details of recurrence and treatment. 3 Check the data of Site of obstruction in Table 1.

## ESPS Peer-review Report

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

**Ms:** 2829

**Title:** Self-expandable metallic stent placement followed by laparoscopy treating acute malignant colorectal obstruction

**Reviewer code:** 00503834

**Science editor:** s.x.gou@wjgnet.com

**Date sent for review:** 2013-03-20 08:25

**Date reviewed:** 2013-03-28 00:22

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

## COMMENTS

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS:

The manuscript "Self-expandable metallic stent placement followed by laparoscopy treating acute malignant colorectal obstruction" is about self expandable metallic stent and laparoscopic colectomy.

1. insertion of self-expandable metallic stent and followed by laparoscopic colectomy of colon cancer, especially left side colon is a accept treatment. In this point, this manuscript seemed to be not innovative. 2. the major drawback of this study are unmatched patient groups, and the large disparity of patient number in each groups. 3. the author(s) may consider add control group in figure 1. The figure legend for fig 1 needs more word to explanation.