

Jin-Lei Wang
Director, Editorial Office
Baishideng Publishing Group Inc.

Dear Dr. Wang,

We would like to thank you and the reviewers for their valuable comments on our original article, manuscript No. 46599, Title: Efficacy and Safety of Standard and Anti Reflux Self Expanding Metal Stent: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. We are grateful for the opportunity to resubmit our manuscript to the World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy.

Response to Reviewers

We would again like to thank the reviewers for their valuable and insightful comments. We have made the changes as suggested. Response are answered in Italics.

Title: - You should include RCT in your title to show that your study is an Evidence A study.

Title was changed as suggested

Abstract: - In the background section you should discuss about indications of stents.

- Indications of stents were added in background section

Results: do not use the word surprisingly in the results sections. Surprisingly should be used in the discussion section.

- Change was made as suggested

Conclusions: I do not think you should include "larger RCT to prove efficiency of anti-reflux esophageal stents over standard stents" in your conclusion. Your systematic review is evidence 1A and is the best way to show no difference between these stents.

-Change was made as suggested

Introduction: - Well written. Great job! - "Palliative chemotherapy, radiation therapy, brachytherapy, and endoscopic management are the available treatment modalities to these patients who present with surgically unresectable cancer." - Include references please. -

- References were added as suggested

“Dysphagia and food bolus impaction are the two most common presentations of esophageal cancer. Placing a stent across the tumor is one of the palliative options to relieve dysphagia, and to improve the quality of life. Nonetheless, placement of esophageal stent is associated with various complications such as stent migration, bleeding, perforation, and stent occlusion. Severe acid reflux is one of the most common symptomatic complaints in patients who undergo standard metal stent placement at tumors involving EGJ or cardia, as the lower esophageal sphincter remains wide open after stent placement” – Include references please. -

- Reference were added as suggested

“GER” – Please write gastroesophageal reflux before abbreviating it.

- Change was made as suggested

Material and Methods/Results: - Did you register this systematic review on PROSPERO? You should register when you follow the PRISMA recommendations. - Please update your search. April 2018 is about one year ago. - When I performed the search using your keywords: esophageal stent OR anti-reflux esophageal stent OR self-expanding metal stent; I found 4615 studies and not just 53. Please clarify your search strategy or correct Figure 1.

- We included randomized controlled trials with anti reflux stent when we performed literature search, hence the lower number of articles available. We updated the key words. We followed the PRISMA recommendation for this study.

“Characteristics of studies and study population” should be described in results section and not methods. Please correct.

- Changes were made as suggested.

The funnel plots (figure 4 and 5) is related with which analysis? You should clarify this information in the figure label and in the text.

- Changes were made as suggested

You should describe the QUADAS results in the results section.

- Changes were made as suggested

The supplementary figure 1 is very small and can not be read. Please modify for larger picture with higher quality.

- We attempted our best to modify the picture. Picture has to be zoomed for better quality.

DISCUSSION: - "We also proved that there was no difference in between the SS and ARS considering secondary endpoints also that included stent migration, bleeding related to stent placement, and occlusion of stent from tumor in growth." - This is the same as you wrote in the paragraph above. - "A meta-analysis done by Yang et.al comparing bare metal esophageal stents with fully covered self expanding metal stents, stent occlusion occurred more in bare metal stents whereas stent migration occurred more in the covered stents" - correct to: In a meta-analysis... - Although more studies showed increased risk of bleeding, stent occlusion, and stent migration with SS; pooled data did not reach statistical significance. - Please include references. - Do not include (Figure 2) in the discussion. - Treatment related deaths were not presented in this study, however, previous network meta-analysis showed that treatment related deaths were reported more in the open stent than those who received anti-reflux stent(20). - Discuss about this result.

Changes were made as suggested. Discussion with results from the original paper was updated in the treatment related death paragraph.

Conclusion: - I do not think you should include "larger RCT to prove efficiency of anti-reflux esophageal stents over standard stents" in your conclusion. Your systematic review is evidence 1A and is the best way to show no difference between these stents

- Changes were made as suggested