

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 5084

Title: Smoking, alcohol drinking and the risk of extrahepatic cholangiocarcinoma: a meta-analysis

Reviewer code: 00069262

Science editor: Qi, Yuan

Date sent for review: 2013-08-14 17:02

Date reviewed: 2013-08-26 09:14

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	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	language polishing	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

It is a good study which analyzes existing literature on the effect of cigarette and ethanol consumption on extrahepatic cholangiocarcinoma. It would seem desirable to add to the paper, the following: that there are other risk factors? Since both the cigarette and alcohol consumption can be prevented by not smoking or drinking alcohol, is prevented disease? You could add a picture of how the cigar favors the formation of extrahepatic cholangiocarcinoma. With his results could only state that smoking is a risk factor for extrahepatic cholangiocarcinoma high?

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 5084

Title: Smoking, alcohol drinking and the risk of extrahepatic cholangiocarcinoma: a meta-analysis

Reviewer code: 02457592

Science editor: Qi, Yuan

Date sent for review: 2013-08-14 17:02

Date reviewed: 2013-08-26 16:30

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 type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	language polishing	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This meta-analysis by Ye et colleagues investigates the association of smoking and alcohol drinking with extrahepatic cholangiocarcinoma (ECC). Authors found an increased risk of ECC for smoking and a non-significant association for alcohol drinking. This is a well written paper with appropriate statistical analyses and calibrated conclusions. I think that this manuscript could be published in the World Journal of Gastroenterology. However, I have some comments. 1. Only seven studies were found on the association between alcohol drinking and ECC after literature search. According to me this number looked too small and unbelievable. I wonder whether authors considered for inclusion only studies evaluating the association between none versus any alcohol drinking. In fact, other studies such as Bulajic 2002 [PMID 12404289], Zatonski 1997 [PMID 9262251], Grainge 2009 [PMID 19018260], Zhang 2006 [PMID 16395699], Murata 1996 [PMID 8939341], Yi 2010 [PMID 20234107], Ishiguro 2008 [PMID 17906958] and Yagyu 2008 [PMID 17955487] did not appear in the meta-analysis. So, my question is: if a study reported the relative risks (RRs) associated to different levels of alcohol consumption (or smoking) and did not report the RR for none versus any alcohol drinking (or smoking), this was not considered in the meta-analysis? If so, authors should clearly specify it in the Materials and Methods section. 2. Authors evaluated study quality by using the Newcastle-Ottawa scale (Table 2). However, no analyses have been conducted to verify the impact of study quality on the final pooled RR. In the methods section, authors declared that "Studies achieving seven or more stars were considered to be of the higher quality". I could note that the majority of studies (10 out of 12) could be considered of higher quality. Since in this framework a stratified analysis of studies of higher quality versus lower quality is not feasible due to small number of low quality studies, a sensitivity analysis could be performed to assess the impact on the final pooled RR of the two studies

of lower quality. 3. In the first sentence of the discussion authors state that “this is the first study to provide the comprehensive evidence on the associations of smoking and alcohol drinking with the risk of ECC development”. However, a previous meta-analysis of Kan et colleagues [PMID 21794037] evaluates the issue “Alcohol drinking and risk of extrahepatic bile system cancer”. For what regards smoking, a very recent meta-analysis by Ding et colleagues [PMID 23085578] was published. Authors should mention these papers in the Discussion, and they should try to compare the results of the two investigations. 4. The Q and the I² statistics were reported in Table 3 to quantify between studies heterogeneity. Please give a brief description of these statistics in the Statistical analysis section. 5. The reference of Moerman et al. 1994 was reported twice, i.e. reference number 17 and number 39. 6. I suggest to the authors to change the two labels inside Figure 2 and 3. “Study ID” should be changed into “Study author” and ES (95% CI) should be changed into “RR (95% CI)”.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 5084

Title: Smoking, alcohol drinking and the risk of extrahepatic cholangiocarcinoma: a meta-analysis

Reviewer code: 00069297

Science editor: Qi, Yuan

Date sent for review: 2013-08-14 17:02

Date reviewed: 2013-08-26 17:52

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	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript does a good job of summarizing a meta analysis of the rapidly evolving literature regarding the potential association between smoking/drinking and extrahepatic cholangiocarcinoma. The authors suggested that smoking rather than drinking may be associated with extrahepatic cholangiocarcinoma risk. The authors also concluded that there was a positive but non-significant correlation between drinking and this tumor. The statistical analysis reported in the manuscript was appropriate. Although the results presented here could be interesting, the study seems less power. The reviewer believed the number of selected literature and the study population in this meta analysis perhaps was not large enough for supporting the present conclusion in the manuscript. Especially, the authors should explain and discussion what and why were the differences between Asian and non Asian about the association between smoking/drinking and extrahepatic cholangiocarcinoma development. In addition, some language should be improved by an English-native expert if available. However, the contents would give significant information. Thus, I do not hesitate that this would be acceptable if the Author(s) give a Major Revision.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 5084

Title: Smoking, alcohol drinking and the risk of extrahepatic cholangiocarcinoma: a meta-analysis

Reviewer code: 00069297

Science editor: Qi, Yuan

Date sent for review: 2013-08-14 17:02

Date reviewed: 2013-08-26 17:53

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	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript does a good job of summarizing a meta analysis of the rapidly evolving literature regarding the potential association between smoking/drinking and extrahepatic cholangiocarcinoma. The authors suggested that smoking rather than drinking may be associated with extrahepatic cholangiocarcinoma risk. The authors also concluded that there was a positive but non-significant correlation between drinking and this tumor. The statistical analysis reported in the manuscript was appropriate. Although the results presented here could be interesting, the study seems less power. The reviewer believed the number of selected literature and the study population in this meta analysis perhaps was not large enough for supporting the present conclusion in the manuscript. Especially, the authors should explain and discussion what and why were the differences between Asian and non Asian about the association between smoking/drinking and extrahepatic cholangiocarcinoma development. In addition, some language should be improved by an English-native expert if available. However, the contents would give significant information. Thus, I do not hesitate that this would be acceptable if the Author(s) give a Major Revision.