

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 15329

Title: Comparison of endoscopic stenting for malignant biliary obstruction: A single-center study

Reviewer's code: 02942838

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2014-11-23 09:41

Date reviewed: 2014-12-04 11:00

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	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

The paper clarified the clinical usefulness of one-step self-expandable metal stent placement for malignant biliary obstruction by comparing with two-step SEMS placement. The work is well-done and provides promising results to the one step SEMS placement. However there are still some questions to be clear: 1. please indicate the criteria of technical success rate and complication rate in Methods; 2. How was the period of hospitalization defined? 3. The changes of total-bilirubin after the placement is important to indicate the symptomatic relief.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 15329

Title: Comparison of endoscopic stenting for malignant biliary obstruction: A single-center study

Reviewer's code: 02455208

Reviewer's country: Greece

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2014-11-23 09:41

Date reviewed: 2014-11-27 05:43

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input checked="" 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 manuscript about an interesting issue that has not been published extensively. It is written in fluent, simple English, easy to comprehend. There are several drawbacks however, apart from the fact that it is a retrospective study. Authors conclude that "Single-step endoscopic metal stent placement is effective and safe for the management of obstructive jaundice caused by various inoperable malignancies". To my opinion though, this conclusion can be hardly justified by their findings. 1. Difference in hospital stay is statistically not significant (table 2) 2. According to figure 2, there is no significant difference in stent patency rate. However, this is rather vague and might not include all stent-related complications 3. Authors do not display how they decided to treat a patient with one- or two- step procedure 4. Investigating complications in relation to the type of stent (covered vs. uncovered) could be of value, as they have different characteristics (e.g. in migration) 5. In their discussion, authors state: "However, a recent study [7, 8] comparing the one-step and two-step procedures reported an improved procedure-related complication rate using the one-step procedure with no increase in early complications". However, Hamada et al. conclude that "one-step



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>

SEMS placement for distal malignant biliary obstruction, as compared with two-step SEMS, had a similar overall SEMS dysfunction rate, but was associated with a shorter time to dysfunction and a higher rate of stent migration, despite having potential cost-effectiveness” There is no doubt that the authors have a vast experience and thorough knowledge of malignant biliary obstruction. Nevertheless, should they considered the above points, they would strengthen the manuscript.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 15329

Title: Comparison of endoscopic stenting for malignant biliary obstruction: A single-center study

Reviewer's code: 00227359

Reviewer's country: Turkey

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2014-11-23 09:41

Date reviewed: 2014-11-23 23:51

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" 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	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a retrospective analysis of the MBO patients who were treated by stents palliatively. Authors compared the two types of stenting as single and two stage. The study includes valuable data but the statistics should be checked again before clear comments. When I re-analysed the data, there were some mistakes. P value for the comparison of technical success rate was reported as 0.58 but it should be 1.0 and gender difference, hospital stay differences were reported as not-significant, but I found them as $p < 0.01$ and $p < 0.05$, respectively. Survival and stent patency times were only given as means and standard deviations should be added.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 15329

Title: Comparison of endoscopic stenting for malignant biliary obstruction: A single-center study

Reviewer's code: 01559599

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2014-11-23 09:41

Date reviewed: 2014-11-25 23:06

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 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"/> Duplicate publication	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input checked="" 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

Allocation of Single or Two-step group depends on patients' backgrounds due to its retrospective nature. When CT shows pancreatic cancer with metastasis, many physicians decide to perform single-step metal stent placement without hesitation, but, when CT shows hilar obstruction with no metastasis, they perform temporary plastic stent placement. Although authors noted that there are no differences between Single and Two-step groups, Single-step group of hilar obstruction is significantly lower than that of Two-step group (22.4% vs. 46.3%, $p = 0.03$). Similarly, Single-step group of pancreatic cancer is higher than that of Two-step group (59.2% vs. 31.7%, $p = 0.016$). Single-step method may contribute shortening of hospital stay, but, this must be verified under the uniformed patients' background. Authors should re-create study design and re-examine all statistical analysis.