

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 25979

**Title:** Double covered stent for the treatment of malignant esophageal obstructions: Systematic review and meta-analysis of the literature

**Reviewer's code:** 00003940

**Reviewer's country:** Australia

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2016-03-29 08:13

**Date reviewed:** 2016-05-08 20:49

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

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This paper is very nicely presented and convincingly shows the very satisfactory outcome following the use of the double covered stent.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 25979

**Title:** Double covered stent for the treatment of malignant esophageal obstructions: Systematic review and meta-analysis of the literature

**Reviewer's code:** 01429143

**Reviewer's country:** Italy

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2016-03-29 08:13

**Date reviewed:** 2016-05-09 23:25

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"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a well written review, with correct methodology and clear presentation of the results. The limitations (few studies and sample size) are explained. My only concern is about the evaluation of the efficacy on symptoms resolution following the stenting; the authors reported a score system for the evaluation of dysphagia, but this is presumably an extrapolation of different definitions adapted in different studies. This issue should be better clarified and explained.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 25979

**Title:** Double covered stent for the treatment of malignant esophageal obstructions: Systematic review and meta-analysis of the literature

**Reviewer's code:** 00068404

**Reviewer's country:** China

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2016-03-29 08:13

**Date reviewed:** 2016-05-17 23:46

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 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		<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

This paper performed a systematic review of the literature in order to assess the clinical outcomes of this double-layered covered stent in the treatment of malignant esophageal obstruction. This study showed that patients are likely to benefit more from the unique design of this double-layered covered nitinol stent. This is a well-written paper containing interesting results which merit publication. I suggest this paper should be accepted.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 25979

**Title:** Double covered stent for the treatment of malignant esophageal obstructions: Systematic review and meta-analysis of the literature

**Reviewer's code:** 00504462

**Reviewer's country:** Mexico

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2016-03-29 08:13

**Date reviewed:** 2016-05-19 07:50

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Sir, I want to congratulate you for your review. It is worth publishing. However, it would be interesting to know how you decided to use your dysphagia score classification and how you adapt it to the score classification used in the cited work. Also, I want to know how you can conclude that this stent can "combine the merits of both plain covered and uncovered metal esophageal stent design" when that was not the purpose of your manuscript. Otherwise I hope to hear from you soon, in order to publish it. Thank you for sending it to us Sincerely