

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 21771

Title: Stent type used does not impact complication rate or placement time but can decrease treatment cost for benign and malignant esophageal lesions

Reviewer's code: 03026970

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2015-08-01 16:03

Date reviewed: 2015-08-05 20:08

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> 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		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Both self-expanding esophageal metal stents (SEMS) and self-expanding esophageal plastic stents (SEPS) are considered useful for treatment of malignant or benign esophageal conditions. However, few comparative studies between stent types have been reported. The study compared the safety, efficacy, clinical outcomes, placement ease and cost between SEMS and SEPS for benign or malignant esophageal disorders and found SEPS is cheaper. This may be helpful for clinical doctors in choosing stent types. However, several questions regarding the manuscript should be addressed. 1. The authors should provide the cost of each kind of stent, because we do not know whether the saved cost is due to the decreased cost of stent or decreased cost of other in-hospital costs. 2. The authors should provide more detailed information of the stent used, such as company, stent length, time of the stent retained in the body. And is there any difference between the two groups in these parameters? 3. It would be better the authors provide a series of image to illustrate the procedure. 4. We noticed that several patients received endoscopic dilation before stent insertion, how many patients received dilation and is there any difference between the SEPS or SEMS? 5. How many



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

patients need replacement of the stents, was there any patient need more than two interventions? 6. In Results "patient characteristics", what do you mean by "5 patients had other or undetermined histology", could you please give a more detailed description? Why do you consider they were malignant if the histologic results were undetermined?

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 21771

Title: Stent type used does not impact complication rate or placement time but can decrease treatment cost for benign and malignant esophageal lesions

Reviewer's code: 00036517

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2015-08-01 16:03

Date reviewed: 2015-08-20 15:41

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The part of result is just a little poor. I suggest that authors need add data in the result. I think they should add the events of stant placement.