

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Pharmacology and Therapeutics

ESPS Manuscript NO: 7278

Title: Meta-analysis: EVS versus TIPS for gastric variceal bleeding in patients with cirrhosis

Reviewer code: 00069464

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2013-11-13 11:04

Date reviewed: 2013-11-17 14:32

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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The article compared endoscopic variceal sclerotherapy (EVS) with transjugular intrahepatic portosystemic shunt (TIPS) in terms of variceal rebleeding, hepatic encephalopathy (HE), and survival by meta-analysis. There are several questions: 1. Strictly speaking, only RCT could be used in meta-analysis, and only 3 studies in the meta-analysis, How to evaluate the reliability of the results. 2. The conclusion should add some option proposal between the two therapies. 3. Funnel plot should be added to evaluate the bias, considering the quality of referenced articles.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Pharmacology and Therapeutics

ESPS Manuscript NO: 7278

Title: Meta-analysis: EVS versus TIPS for gastric variceal bleeding in patients with cirrhosis

Reviewer code: 01560498

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2013-11-13 11:04

Date reviewed: 2013-11-24 00:31

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existed	<input checked="" 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	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This paper is well written. Sample number is small ($n = 220$), but I guess power analysis is possible. From the viewpoint of in preventing gastric variceal rebleeding, it is easy to understand that transjugular intrahepatic portosystemic shunt is more effective than endoscopic variceal sclerotherapy. It is informative that transjugular intrahepatic portosystemic shunt for the prevention of gastric variceal rebleeding is associated with increased risk of hepatic encephalopathy, and there is no survival difference between groups.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Pharmacology and Therapeutics

ESPS Manuscript NO: 7278

Title: Meta-analysis: EVS versus TIPS for gastric variceal bleeding in patients with cirrhosis

Reviewer code: 00054986

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2013-11-13 11:04

Date reviewed: 2013-12-25 18:07

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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input checked="" 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"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Congratulations on your scientific article. It is well written and presented. I have made a few suggestions and need some clarifications. There is a potential bias in your results due to the heterogeneous nature of the studies included in the meta analysis.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Pharmacology and Therapeutics

ESPS Manuscript NO: 7278

Title: Meta-analysis: EVS versus TIPS for gastric variceal bleeding in patients with cirrhosis

Reviewer code: 00070628

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2013-11-13 11:04

Date reviewed: 2013-12-27 19:17

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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The meta-analysis compared two different techniques in terms of variceal gastric bleeding, encephalopathy and survival. It is well written. Nevertheless, I would like to comment some items. 1. There are few randomized clinical trials included in this meta-analysis (only one prospective randomized clinical trial), so conclusion could have some bias. I know that there are few studies regarding this question. I wonder if conclusions from this meta-analysis were robust 2. Authors could add the funnel plot. There are forest plot, but funnel plot is important due to show possible bias. Please, amend this if it is possible. 3. During the selections of studies, they must show all studies they could find. When they write "relevant conferences", could they explain which one? 4. There are some abbreviation not defined, i.e. ET.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Pharmacology and Therapeutics

ESPS Manuscript NO: 7278

Title: Meta-analysis: EVS versus TIPS for gastric variceal bleeding in patients with cirrhosis

Reviewer code: 00070280

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2013-11-13 11:04

Date reviewed: 2014-01-13 16:26

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"/> Existed	<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	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a very interesting topic. The authors have clearly acknowledged the limitations of the study.