



Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited

Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,
315-321 Lockhart Road,
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 2849

Title: SEMS versus cSEMS in duodenal and small bowel obstruction: high risk of migration in the covered stent group

Reviewer code: 00070143

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2013-03-20 11:05

Date reviewed: 2013-03-21 22:25

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existed	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This study was compared the complications and effectivity of SEMS versus CSEMS. It is nice observational case study. However, It is retrospective. Therefore it is not easy to compare these outcomes objectively. 1-Authors mentioned that covered stent migration rate was higher. This is expected outcome for covered stent. Also, this may be related the localization of tumors. Did they analyze the correlation of location and migration? 2-Ingrowth rate was also similar in two groups. This may be related to the short survival. 3-It is not clear that how many patients had biliary stents in two groups. Biliary obstruction was not observed in two groups. This is a retrospective study. Authors, probably prefer the biliary stent who needs. They should discuss these results in discussion.



Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited

Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,
315-321 Lockhart Road,
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 2849

Title: SEMS versus cSEMS in duodenal and small bowel obstruction: high risk of migration in the covered stent group

Reviewer code: 00722601

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2013-03-20 11:05

Date reviewed: 2013-03-22 02:48

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade B (Very good)	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Existed	<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"/> [] No records	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> [] Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Grade D: rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> [] Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> [] Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> [] No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

It's an interesting and well-written article. It's needed a deeper explanation of relation between location of cancer and migration rates in cSEMS group. Short follow-up in relation with a high mortality rate. Minor grammatical revision is needed. A clearer redaction of factors that could contribute on migration is recommended.



Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited

Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,
315-321 Lockhart Road,
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 2849

Title: SEMS versus cSEMS in duodenal and small bowel obstruction: high risk of migration in the covered stent group

Reviewer code: 00051746

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2013-03-20 11:05

Date reviewed: 2013-03-22 19:47

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Authors conducted the comparison about the clinical success and complications between self-expanding metal stents (SEMS) and covered SEMS (cSEMS) in duodenal and small bowel obstruction. They found that cSEMS is accompanied with a high rate of migration in comparison to SEMS although the rate of stent overgrowth or the duration until migration was similar between the two stent types. I think that this is a valuable study which suggests a weakness of cSEMS in duodenal and small bowel obstruction. However, this study has some minor problems regarding methodology or interpretation of results. Please consider the following points. 1. Author should describe about endoscopists who performed endoscopic procedure. Were the placements of SEMS or cSEMS performed by experienced endoscopists? 2. Authors had better show the obstructive symptoms of patients in Table 1 (Patients' characteristics). 3. Authors had better the procedure time of each SEMS or cSEMS in Table 2. Was the procedure time similar between SEMS and cSEMS?



Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited

Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,
315-321 Lockhart Road,
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 2849

Title: SEMS versus cSEMS in duodenal and small bowel obstruction: high risk of migration in the covered stent group

Reviewer code: 00070632

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2013-03-20 11:05

Date reviewed: 2013-04-07 04:01

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y]Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y]Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y]Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Editor, There are a lot of published in the literatures. This study has not different contribution to literature. For that reason this study is not worth to published at your journal. King regards.