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Reviewer’s report:

This paper is a meta-analysis about the results of covered vs. uncovered SEMS for GOO.

This review article is well summarized and this information may be useful for general practice. However, in recent, there is a similar meta-analysis. I thus ask authors to amend something as shown below.

1. Similar meta-analysis has been recently published (Int J Med Sci. 2013 Apr 27;10(7):825-35). Although this meta-analysis used only prospective study and RCT, conclusion is the same. Lee’s (2009) and Kim’s (2010) studies were used in this meta-analysis, which were also used in your meta-analysis, but meta-analysis using only prospective study is easier and more feasible for interpretation... I ask you to compare your analysis with this meta-analysis and discuss about that.

2. Please describe the kind and number of cancer in your using studies.

3. Chemotherapeutic drugs has been recently developed for malignancies with GOO including gastric cancer. Description about the presence or absence of chemotherapy after SEMS in each study would provide useful information for the readers if those data are available.

4. Why don’t you use the retrospective study of Gastrointest Endosc. 2007 May;65(6):782-7? Is this study already duplicate in your analysis?
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