

July 7, 2015

Jing Yu

Science Editor, Editorial Office

World Journal of Gastroenterology

Baishideng Publishing Group

Subject: Submission of revised manuscript (**WJG-19267**)

Dear Dr. Yu,

Thank you for your letter regarding our paper entitled “**Diagnostic and therapeutic single-operator cholangiopancreatography in biliopancreatic diseases: Prospective multicenter study in Japan**”.

We are very grateful for your careful review and consideration of our manuscript. We have carefully revised our paper in accordance with all the important comments raised. Our point-by-point responses are written below.

We hope that the revised manuscript is now suitable for publication in the *World Journal of Gastroenterology*.

Thank you for considering our revised manuscript. We look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Toshio Kurihara, MD

Department of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, Tokyo Medical University

6-7-1 Nishishinjuku, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo 160-0023, Japan

E-mail: Kurihara618@gmail.com

Phone: +81-3-3342-6111

Fax: +81-3-5381-6654

POINT-BY-POINT RESPONSES

Major points

1. Please add the detailed inclusion and exclusion criteria in this study.

Response:

Thank you for your important suggestion. We added the detailed inclusion and exclusion criteria in the METHODS section as follows (Page 12, lines 2-9 of the revised clean version)

“Eligibility for study entry was based on age 20 years or older and the existence of an indication for cholangiopancreatography. In the diagnostic procedure, the patient main inclusion criteria were indeterminate biliary and pancreatic duct stricture and filling defect. In the therapeutic procedure, the main inclusion criteria were biliary and pancreatic stones that were treatable by conventional lithotripsy. The exclusion criteria included age younger than 20 years, pregnancy, bleeding diatheses, distorted anatomy, severe jaundice or cholangitis, critically ill patients, and inability to provide informed consent.”

2. In the study design, prospectively enrolled, and retrospectively analyzed study is more proper description

Response:

We appreciate your helpful comment. We made the appropriate description in the METHODS section as follows (Page 11, line 15 to Page 12, line 1):

“A total of 154 patients were prospectively enrolled and retrospectively analyzed.”

3. In this article, the number of table is too much. If possible, reduce the number of table.

Response:

We apologize that there appears to be many tables in the manuscript. After a careful review of the manuscript and tables, we considered that most of the tables are needed to sustain and validate our conclusion. Nonetheless, we deleted Table 9 to at least reduce the number of tables. We appreciate your consideration regarding the importance and retention of the remaining tables.

Minor points

1. In abstract, please describe the each patient number of biliary and pancreatic diseases, respectively.

Response:

Thank you for appropriate and valuable comments. We added the specific numbers of patients for biliary and pancreatic diseases in the abstract as follows (Page 7, lines 6-7):

“There were 148 patients who underwent SOCPS, 124 for biliary diseases and 24 for pancreatic diseases.”

2. Please describe the criteria for the adequate tissue for histological examination.

Response:

We appreciate your important suggestion. In accordance with your comment, we defined the criteria for adequate tissues as sufficient quantity of tissue by which pathologists could make a histological diagnosis. We added the following phrase in the METHODS section (Page 15, lines 13-14)

“Adequate tissue was defined as sufficient quantity of tissue enabling a pathologist to make a histological diagnosis.”