

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 11677

**Title:** Meta-analysis of pancreatic stent placement in preventing pancreatitis

**Reviewer's code:** 01333284

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2014-05-30 00:05

**Date reviewed:** 2014-06-14 23:17

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existing	<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"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Fan et al in their manuscript entitled "Meta-analysis of pancreatic stent placement in preventing pancreatitis" evaluate the existing literature on this topic. The quality standards for inclusion are high and their methodology is sound. This is an interesting and valuable contribution.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology**ESPS manuscript NO:** 11677**Title:** Meta-analysis of pancreatic stent placement in preventing pancreatitis**Reviewer's code:** 01779392**Reviewer's country:** China**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma**Date sent for review:** 2014-05-30 00:05**Date reviewed:** 2014-06-15 11:32

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<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		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Pancreatitis is one of the most common and severe complications after ERCP. It can result in prolonged hospital stays and increased medical costs and might be life threatening to high-risk patients. Because PD stent placement can prevent pancreatic duct drainage impairment due to papillary edema or sphincter spasm, it might be an effective option to prevent PEP. It has been reported that pancreatic stent placement could prevent post-ERCP pancreatitis (PEP) by improving pancreatic drainage. The objective of this study was to investigate the efficacy and safety profile of PD stent placement for EPP prevention. Therefore, the title may be suggested to instead of "Update of meta-analysis of pancreatic stent placement in preventing pancreatitis post-ERCP". At the same time, there are lot of major problems as follow: 1. These retrieved randomized controlled clinical trials of PD stent placement that were published clinical trials (15) in English or Chinese and had full texts (12) or abstracts(3), the abstracts were 20% and they can affect reliability of results. So the abstracts may be suggested to delete. 2. In the stent group, 49 of the 1,233(4.01%) patients suffered from PEP, compared to 133 of 1,277 (10.42%) in the no stent group. In the discussion should explain why occur pancreatitis after stent placement. 3. The medication strategies were not included in the analysis, but the medication strategies may affect the results. So should be added in the paper. 4. The based disease of patients may be affected the reliability of results, So should be discussed in the paper.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 11677

**Title:** Meta-analysis of pancreatic stent placement in preventing pancreatitis

**Reviewer's code:** 01560462

**Reviewer's country:** Japan

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2014-05-30 00:05

**Date reviewed:** 2015-01-05 13:39

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existing	<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"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

It is meta-analysis having very high completeness. It is thought that there is not the big problem about the acceptance.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 11677

**Title:** Meta-analysis of pancreatic stent placement in preventing pancreatitis

**Reviewer's code:** 03035214

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2014-05-30 00:05

**Date reviewed:** 2015-01-11 10:51

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existing	<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"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This meta analysis provides an excellent exhaustive coverage of all salient points to be covered while presenting a meta analysis according to the suggestions checklist by the QUORUM group. I commend the authors on an effective re-review of the same. Overall presentation of the manuscript, quality of the analysis and the appropriateness of images and tables is highly satisfactory. However I do have one question for the authors. Was any attempt made to collect unpublished data or results of any trials that are underway at known major centers of excellence?

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 11677

**Title:** Meta-analysis of pancreatic stent placement in preventing pancreatitis

**Reviewer's code:** 02440510

**Reviewer's country:** Bosnia and Herzegovina

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2014-05-30 00:05

**Date reviewed:** 2015-01-12 08:25

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existing	<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"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Manuscript Number: 11677, titled "Updated meta-analysis of pancreatic stent placement in preventing pancreatitis post-endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography". This is a meta-analysis evaluating the efficacy and safety profile of pancreatic duct stent placement for post-endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography pancreatitis prevention. General Comments: The manuscript is well organized and written, and I'm sure that brings useful information to the scientific community and clinical practice.