

Format for ANSWERING REVIEWERS



July 23, 2014

Dear Editor,

Please find enclosed the edited manuscript in Word format (file name: 12035-review.doc).

Title: Accuracy of magnetic resonance cholangiography compared to operative endoscopy in biliary stones detection, a single center experience.

Authors Francesco Polistina, M Frego, M Bisello, E Manzi, B Perin, A Vardanega

Name of Journal: *World Journal of Radiology*

ESPS Manuscript NO: 12035

The manuscript has been improved according to the suggestions of reviewers:

Revision has been made according to the suggestions of the peer reviewers

Reviewer 1

I read thoroughly the paper by Polistina et al regarding the accuracy of MRCP compared to operative endoscopy. The experience of this center shows that choledocholithiasis is under diagnosed in MRCP, especially when the size of the biliary stones is less than 5mm diameter. This paper suffers from limitations especially in the bibliography used and cannot be considered for publication in this form. The authors have to get through the paper again, check the references that they used and changed them with more relevant and recent.

Page 8 – 2nd paragraph: Percentage of sensitivity, specificity, and accuracy must be shown in the main text (not only in the Table 1).

a- done, thank you for suggesting

Are the differences among the diagnostic performance of MRCP and ERCP statistically significant?

Please add the P-values of these comparisons?

a- I added in the text data for sensitivity, specificity, accuracy and PPV/NPV for either both EUS alone and EUS/ERCP and some comments on them. I am not sure I understood the second part of the question. Are you meaning I should have a statistical comparison between two non-continuous, non-categorical data from such a small cohort of patients? If so, I wonder which test to be used. ROC curves would be insignificant due to the lack of a clear cut off level, I can calculate them using the size of the calculi as reference points but it appears to me more like a good statistical exercise than a reliable evaluation. McNemara test would allow to get a p value on which real statistical significance one may debate for a very long time. Ask for suggestion, if I may.

The authors start writing the “Discussion” as a review of the literature commenting on the advantages of gadoxetic disodium. However, this study is dealing mainly with a single center experience, so the discussion must begin with their results and comments on them?

a- you're right, I agree. The first paragraph of discussion appear as you already stated. We decided to write it that

way intending it as a, maybe redundant, introduction to the issue. Moreover, basing on other's reviewer suggestion we decided to remove the review of literature from the title and, obviously, from the paper itself.

Page 9 – 1st paragraph: The authors use the references [11-14] as recent studies dealing with the use of contrast in MRCP. However, these papers are not recent. Besides, ref.13 and ref.14 are not dealing with the use of contrast. Indeed, there are more recent papers that should be discussed such as Lee et al at J Comput Assist Tomogr 2014, Choi et al at Clin Imaging 2014, Reiner et al at AJR Am J Roentgenol 2013, Kantarci et al at Eur Radiol 2013 and others. ?

a- The whole list of citations was a complete mess. This was due to a mine mistake. I prepared the manuscript and the bibliography as separate files and attached the wrong file when preparing the manuscript for submission. I really apologize with you and the editors. The whole work has been corrected now. Thank you for highlighting. And thanks twice for suggesting two papers I did not include neither in the correct file.

Page 10, lines 3-4: The sentence “These patients were initially asymptomatic on the blood test that showed normal values” must be changed to “These patients had initially normal blood tests”?

a- nice suggestion, I did it. Thanks again.

Page 10, 2nd paragraph: Ref.17-29, 27, 28 are not relevant, since there is no use of MRCP with contrast material in any of them?

a- once again I must agree with you. Same cause of the previous point. I apologize once again.

MRCP is an observer dependent method, so a comment on this fact should be added and discussed.

-a I agree. Add a comment on this.

Reviewer 2

Polistina et al. submitted the manuscript entitled “Accuracy of magnetic resonance cholangiography compared to operative endoscopy, a single center experience, and literature review” for peer review. The paper is a retrospective study conducted on patients who underwent MRCP and subsequent ERCP for the study of biliary symptoms. The Authors compare the accuracy of the two interventions in the diagnosis of the biliary cause of the symptoms. A number of remarks are listed below:

Major remarks:

- The Authors should specify in the title that MRCP and ERCP are compared for accuracy in detecting biliary stones.

a- done

The review of literature appears to be a normal part of the discussion rather than an extensive evaluation of the current literature. The authors should expand this part with additional information (e.g. indications for MRCP and ERCP in specific clinical settings and complication rates). Alternatively, they should omit the “literature review” from Title and Methods. –

a- I do completely agree with you, I removed the review of literature from the paper

The Authors should better explain how many patients received an ERCP because of abnormalities seen on MRCP (and with which concordance between the two procedures) and how many received ERCP because of persisting cholestasis. Moreover, clinical and laboratory findings of patients who underwent MRCP could be better summarized.

a- good suggestion. Data you are asking for were disseminated through the results section. I added a specific

table that appears very useful in simplifying the understanding. Thanks for suggesting.

The Authors should double check the reference list for accuracy and repetitions.

a- The whole list of citations was a complete mess. This was due to a mine mistake. I prepared the manuscript and the bibliography as separate files and attached the wrong file when preparing the manuscript for submission. I really apologize with you and the editors. The whole work has been corrected now. Thank you for highlighting.

Minor remarks: -

- In Table 1, the Authors should state the parameters for which sensitivity and specificity are calculated. –

a- done

The paper should be revised for grammatical errors, omissions and punctuation.

a- the paper underwent a professional language editing from the Scribendi Inc. 304-405 Riverview Drive. Chatham, Ontario N7M 0N3 Canada. I can, on request, provide the editing certificate.

Thank you again for publishing our manuscript in the *World Journal of Gastroenterology*.

Sincerely yours,

Correspondence to: Francesco A Polistina, MD, Viale G Marconi, 19, 35043 Monselice, Italy.

francescopolistina@hotmail.it

Telephone: +39429788280 Fax: +39429788022