

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 77847

Title: Pitfalls and promises of bile duct alternatives: A narrative review

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03011479

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, MHSc, PhD

Professional title: Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Brazil

Author's Country/Territory: Japan

Manuscript submission date: 2022-06-14

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-06-17 11:33

Reviewer performed review: 2022-06-20 02:33

Review time: 2 Days and 15 Hours

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 Grade E: Do not publish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



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Well written paper. Interesting topic.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 77847

Title: Pitfalls and promises of bile duct alternatives: A narrative review

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05077783

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, MSc

Professional title: Assistant Professor, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Brazil

Author's Country/Territory: Japan

Manuscript submission date: 2022-06-14

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-07-09 15:02

Reviewer performed review: 2022-07-11 20:04

Review time: 2 Days and 5 Hours

Scientific quality	<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
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors provide a review on the use of bile duct substitutes for the treatment of bile duct lesions. This is a promising area of research, and is of scientific interest. The review is very complete, but writing in the English language needs to be revised. Some issues that must be addressed: 1- In the first line of the abstract, "biliodigestive anastomosis" instead of "reconstruction of anastomosis" would better convey the meaning of the sentence; 2 - In the abstract, "bioabsorbable material" is listed twice among the types of BDS; 3- On page 3 line 12, "However" instead of "however"; 4- On page 3 line 17, "are considered high-risk factors". In the conclusion section, the authors could mention what type of bioabsorbable materials show promise as potential BDS, and what are the perspectives for other types of BDS (such as autologous tissue).

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 77847

Title: Pitfalls and promises of bile duct alternatives: A narrative review

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05260676

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: FASGE, PhD

Professional title: Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Japan

Manuscript submission date: 2022-06-14

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-07-09 13:15

Reviewer performed review: 2022-07-16 02:17

Review time: 6 Days and 13 Hours

Scientific quality	<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
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The review is suitable for clinical practice. The authors read a large amount of relevant literature , and have a very profound understanding of the biliary tract injury. However, the authors did not propound specific and constructive opinion to resolve the problem (biliary strictures , the bile plug)

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 77847

Title: Pitfalls and promises of bile duct alternatives: A narrative review

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05077783

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, MSc

Professional title: Assistant Professor, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Brazil

Author's Country/Territory: Japan

Manuscript submission date: 2022-06-14

Reviewer chosen by: Jing-Jie Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-08-19 05:48

Reviewer performed review: 2022-08-20 01:29

Review time: 19 Hours

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The corrected manuscript is clearly written and of scientific value, and I have no further observations. I congratulate the authors on this interesting work.