



ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 20040

Title: Current status of endoscopic biliary drainage for unresectable malignant hilar biliary strictures

Reviewer's code: 03026444

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Jing Yu

Date sent for review: 2015-05-31 12:42

Date reviewed: 2015-06-13 13:34

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		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Authors reviewed many studies related to endoscopic biliary stenting for malignant hilar obstruction and summarized them. The manuscript is well organized and instructive for readers. However, some points were unclear and indicated below. Please check the following points. Major comments: 1. There are some sentences that are hard to understand, eg p.8 l.19. Please polish their expression up for easily understanding. 2. Authors mentioned "It would seem that differences in the difficulties of unilateral and bilateral deployment have not been as obvious in recent years." P.7 l.14. Although, devices have been recently improved for easy bilateral stent placement, technical difficulty between unilateral and bilateral is still not comparable. If authors want to say "differences have not been obvious", they must show more evidences, or eliminate this sentence. 3. Authors summarized only the result of re-intervention for the table. For reader's well-understanding, please summarize the other results for tables or figures about MS vs PS, uni vs bilateral, and SIS vs SBS. Minor comments: 1. Please revise the table following previous comments "Occlusion(%) in Fujii et al. and Lee et al."



ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 20040

Title: Current status of endoscopic biliary drainage for unresectable malignant hilar biliary strictures

Reviewer’s code: 00504427

Reviewer’s country: Japan

Science editor: Jing Yu

Date sent for review: 2015-05-31 12:42

Date reviewed: 2015-06-14 08:23

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a review article about previous published data related to endoscopic biliary stenting for malignant hilar obstruction. I thoroughly reviewed the article and all references, and confirm the accuracy of the contents. The text is well-organized, and discussion paragraph includes a lot of useful information, including the efficacy of current devices for endoscopic biliary stenting. As a whole, I believe that this article should be useful for discussing adequate stenting methods of endoscopic biliary drainage. Minor revisions will make this article more comprehensive, and make it possible for publication. Please respond to reviewer’s comments as described below. Minor Revision 1. In the main text, there is a lot of data about endoscopic biliary stenting for malignant hilar obstruction. However, authors only summarized the results of re-intervention after stent occlusion in Table 1. This isn’t well-balanced. If authors want to summarize the previously published data in Table for reader’s better understanding, authors should summarize all data discussed in the main text, such as plastic versus metallic stents, unilateral versus bilateral drainage, and SIS versus SBS methods in Tables. 2. page 7; reference 10 appears in the main text before reference 9. Please arrange the references in a



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>

correct order. 3. page 8, line 20; among the patients achieving disease control, the patency period and survival time of the 4- or 3-branched group were significantly longer than those of the 2- or 1-branched group. The ambiguous expression of “disease control” is hard to understand. Authors should explain the meaning of “disease control” in greater detail for better understanding to readers. 4. page 11, line 5; although SBS was attempted prior to PSIS in four of seven patients in the SIS group. What the exact meaning of PSIS? In page 9, authors explain the meaning of “SIS” as an abbreviation for parietal stent-in stent. Do authors use PSIS and SIS as the same meaning? Authors should clear the meaning of PSIS for better understanding to readers.