



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,  
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**Manuscript NO:** 38317

**Title:** Intraoperative frozen section diagnosis of bile duct margin for extrahepatic cholangiocarcinoma

**Reviewer's code:** 00053888

**Reviewer's country:** United Kingdom

**Science editor:** Ze-Mao Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2018-02-14

**Date reviewed:** 2018-02-15

**Review time:** 1 Day

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [ Y ] Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> [ Y ] Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> [ Y ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> [ Y ] No	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> [ Y ] No	

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors have compared frozen section on the excision margins in 74 patients undergoing extra-hepatic resection for cholangiocarcinoma with subsequent paraffin section of the same margins. They report that the results of the FS are comparable with the subsequent paraffin section and that the presence of a positive margin is associated with a higher rate of local recurrence of tumour. This is an important and useful study that is well carried out and well reported. I believe that it is very suitable for publication.



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,  
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://www.wjgnet.com**

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**Manuscript NO:** 38317

**Title:** Intraoperative frozen section diagnosis of bile duct margin for extrahepatic cholangiocarcinoma

**Reviewer's code:** 02529835

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Ze-Mao Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2018-02-13

**Date reviewed:** 2018-02-19

**Review time:** 5 Days

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This study evaluated the bile duct margins from 74 patients who underwent surgery for extrahepatic cholangiocarcinoma. The authors found borderline FSD in the epithelial layer could be substantially regarded as negative. I have few specific suggestions as follows: Specific comments: 1. I found your nomenclature of borderline is confusing. Borderline includes case with biliary intraepithelial neoplasia, so basically it means dysplasia, not invasive cancer. The diagnosis is better classified into negative, dysplasia and malignancy. 2. Adding a reference at the end of the 1st paragraph in Introduction. 3. What is the follow-up time of your study group? 4. Adding figures including frozen pictures of biliary intraepithelial neoplasia 1 - 3. 5. There is a lining error in Table 1.



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,  
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://www.wjgnet.com**

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**Manuscript NO:** 38317

**Title:** Intraoperative frozen section diagnosis of bile duct margin for extrahepatic cholangiocarcinoma

**Reviewer's code:** 01588404

**Reviewer's country:** India

**Science editor:** Ze-Mao Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2018-02-14

**Date reviewed:** 2018-02-22

**Review time:** 8 Days

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting manuscript by the authors comparing the frozen and permanent section analysis of their duct margin in cholangiocarcinoma. Major points: 1. The authors have not mentioned the impact of prior stenting instrumentation especially in light of almost 40% borderline epithelial margins which significantly decrease on PSD. This might be due to the above-mentioned reasons as the subepithelial borderline rate is low and does not change on PSD. 2. Although the borderline epithelial lesions on frozen did not change to positive on PSD, one borderline subepithelial lesion changed to positive. In a larger series with more diverse pathologists, it is quite likely that some borderline margins may ultimately turn out to be positive. Hence, the discussion and conclusion should emphasize the need for negative margins whenever positive, especially if it is the first margin and an additional margin can be safely obtained as the local recurrence is very



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,  
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](http://www.wjgnet.com)

high in positives 3. The authors have not analysed proximal (hilar) and distal (periampullary) tumors to see if the concordance and outcomes change.