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Reviewer's report:

The author described Endoscopic balloon dilatation for benign hepaticojejunostomy anastomotic stricture using short double-balloon enteroscopy in cases of prior Whipple's procedure: a retrospective study.

This is an interesting article because of referring long-term outcome of endoscopic balloon dilation alone for treating HJAS using double balloon endoscopy.

minor revisions

1. Author's median times of scope insertion and biliary cannulation rate, that is, short term results, are very excellent in present article. Balloon dilation under double balloon endoscopy is first choice for treatment of HJAS? If stent deployment is better, which cases is correct for stent deployment?
2. Author's success rate of inserting double balloon endoscopy to HJ anastomosis is 100%, very high and inserting time is median 13 minutes, short. Difficulty of inserting double balloon endoscopy is similar among enrolled cases in this present article?
3. Are these results similar compared with those of other stricture, for example, Roux-en-Y anastomosis?
4. Author's long-term HJA patency at one, two, and three year were 73%, 55%, and 49%, respectively. What do authors think about these long term outcomes comparison of percutaneous transhepatic treatment?
5. On respect of long term outcomes, stent deployment is considered as better treatment than balloon dilation only?
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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