



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

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

**Manuscript NO:** 69294

**Title:** Percutaneous biliary stent combined with brachytherapy using 125I seeds for the treatment of unresectable malignant obstructive jaundice: A meta-analysis

**Reviewer’s code:** 04668002

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer’s Country/Territory:** Sweden

**Author’s Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-06-24

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-06-25 05:12

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-06-25 05:42

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

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

**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568

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

**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](https://www.wjgnet.com)

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Point 01 The review was not registered in a register for systematic review, such as PROSPERO. Point 02 The search for eligible papers has to be updated. The last one was performed one year ago. Point 03 Many of the results of the review are based on forest plots consisting of very few studies. I can see forest plots with 5, or even 3 or 2 studies. One cannot draw strong conclusions as the authors did with such low level of evidence.