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Reviewer's report:

This is a prospective, non-randomized study of patients with refractory benign esophageal strictures treated with 3 types of stents. Stent placement was a late step in the management of this difficult problem and the results reflect that. Though the minority of patients in the study achieved long term success, it appears that biodegradable stents or fully covered self-expanding metal stents are preferable to self-expanding plastic stents which are associated with more frequent stent migration, more reinterventions and fewer cases of long-term improvement (though not statistically significant).

In general, the methods are well described and the data/results appear sound and are well outlined.

Furthermore, the discussion and conclusions are well balanced and supported by the data. Limitations are clearly stated and the authors do a good job in acknowledging previously published studies.

Major Revisions: none

Minor Revisions:

1. Since the study is not randomized, please describe more clearly how the type of stent was chosen. Was it at the discretion of the endoscopist, or was it done consecutively (for instance 10 SEPS, then 10 biodegradable, then 10 SEMS)?
2. Paragraph 6 in Results: would change wording to: "In our study, 30% of patients in the biodegradable stent group were dysphagia free..."
3. Typo in Table 1, column 1 Post-surgical 4 out of 10 should be (40%) not (10%)

Discretionary Revisions: none.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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