

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 46599

**Title:** Efficacy and Safety of Standard and Anti Reflux Self Expanding Metal Stent: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

**Reviewer's code:** 02465209

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Jin-Lei Wang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-02-18 13:16

**Reviewer performed review:** 2019-02-18 13:25

**Review time:** 1 Hour

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input type="checkbox"/> No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Well written.

### INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](https://www.wjgnet.com)

*Google Search:*

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

*BPG Search:*

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 46599

**Title:** Efficacy and Safety of Standard and Anti Reflux Self Expanding Metal Stent: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

**Reviewer's code:** 03706560

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Jin-Lei Wang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-02-18 13:54

**Reviewer performed review:** 2019-02-19 16:09

**Review time:** 1 Day and 2 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a well-done systematic review and meta-analysis in an interesting topic. In general, the quality of the study is very good; however, some concerns need to be addressed. Title: - You should include RCT in your title to show that your study is an

Evidence A study. Abstract: - In the background section you should discuss about indications of stents. - Results: do not use the word surprisingly in the results sections. Surprisingly should be used in the discussion section. - 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. 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. - “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. - “GER” - Please write gastroesophageal reflux before abbreviating it. 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. - “Characteristics of studies and study population” should be described in results section and not methods. Please correct. - 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. - You should describe the QUADAS results in the results section. - The

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

## INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

### *Google Search:*

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

### *BPG Search:*



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA

**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242

**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243

**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)

**<https://www.wjgnet.com>**

[ ] The same title

[ ] Duplicate publication

[ ] Plagiarism

[ Y ] No