



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 30075

Title: Therapeutic Efficacy and Stent Patency of Transhepatic Portal Vein Stenting after Surgery

Reviewer's code: 02445558

Reviewer's country: United Kingdom

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2016-09-10 15:17

Date reviewed: 2016-09-15 23:30

| 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 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 type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism | <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor | | <input 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 type="checkbox"/> No | |

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors report their experience with portal vein/SMV stenting in patients who had previous HPB surgical resections. The study is well written and interesting as there is very little in the medical literature on this topic. I have few comments: 1) Of the two indications, the physical (gradient > 5 mmHg) and radiological (stenosis > 50%), did you use any of them in isolation or did you need both? The reason is that you can have a radiological stenosis without any symptoms, but a gradient across a stricture indicates an element of portal hypertension. secondly did you stent only the symptomatic patients or any patient fulfilling the above criteria? 2) In the material and methods, can you please explain what you think was the etiological mechanism by which patient developed portal vein stenosis. For instance did you reconstruct the portal vein in some of these patients? This should be clarified in the text. 3) In the study endpoints, did you not consider a resolution of the pressure gradient as an endpoint? If not why not? 4) In the results section on page 9, 5th paragraph, the first follow-up scan was performed 1-162 days after the procedure. it is somehow surprising that at least in one patient radiological follow-up was not carried out for more than 5 months. Please explain why.



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

5) In the discussion, on page 10, the second paragraph is a repetition of the results and should be adjusted. finally I wish to know what was your protocol for anticoagulation if you had one.



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 30075

Title: Therapeutic Efficacy and Stent Patency of Transhepatic Portal Vein Stenting after Surgery

Reviewer's code: 01560036

Reviewer's country: Russia

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2016-09-10 15:17

Date reviewed: 2016-09-19 16:43

| CLASSIFICATION | LANGUAGE EVALUATION | SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT | 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"/> 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 type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism | <input type="checkbox"/> [] Minor revision |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor | | <input type="checkbox"/> [Y] No | <input type="checkbox"/> [] Major revision |
| | | BPG Search: | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> [Y] No | |

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Good and useful article. Some language editing is needed mainly points commas, empty spaces.