

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 61408

Title: Outcomes of laparoscopic bile duct exploration for choledocholithiasis with small common bile duct

Reviewer's code: 02733628

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor, Professor, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Turkey

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-12-05

Reviewer chosen by: Lian-Sheng Ma

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-12-06 12:07

Reviewer performed review: 2020-12-06 13:31

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgooffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Authors, Thank you for sharing your article entitled "Outcomes of laparoscopic bile duct exploration for choledocholithiasis with small common bile duct" written by Xiao-Xiao Huang, Jia-Yi Wu, Yan-Nan Bai, Jun-Yi Wu, Jia-Hui Lv, Wei-Zhao Chen, Li-Ming Huang, Rong-Fa Huang, Mao-Lin Yan. Article is very impressive and important. All other medical staff should read and discuss it. I have some advices to authors to make some revision in article before publication of article. Article should be revised in medical language, spelling and punctuation rules. Authors used some abbreviations in abstract. They should review them. Authors should explain exactly and precisely how they decided the diameter of bile duct before laparoscopic exploration. Up to which radiological modality? Authors should give the exact number of T-tube drainages and the reasons. I think it is very important information in this article. Results part should be revised. Discussion part should be shorter. References should be less. I could not see the tables in full size. I would like to see all tables in appropriate size and with all information it includes. Sincerely

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 61408

Title: Outcomes of laparoscopic bile duct exploration for choledocholithiasis with small common bile duct

Reviewer's code: 05397404

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Sweden

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-12-05

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-12-07 08:46

Reviewer performed review: 2020-12-07 16:06

Review time: 7 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In order to do a fair review I need to see the completed table 1 and 2, The format word only show a halv of theses tables. tables are easier to see a separated file The preliminary review is: I find the manuscript interesting because of the large number of patients enrolled in the study however I have three comments: 1. The study does not show a more specific details of the stone size such an histogram, this study has the size of the stone as the principal variable, a such important variable should be presented deeply so near raw data as possible. 2. Table 1 does not show the maximum and the minimum of the diameter of the stones in both groups, the values of the stones: 1.171 ± 0.518 vs 0.717 ± 0.351 have not explanation if it is a mean . A median is appropriated in order to know if the majority of the stones in small CBD are between 0.7-0.8 cm or not. 3. The study does not discuss the alternative to use transcystic LCBDE in small CBD instead for laparoscopic choledochotomy and choledochoscopy. A study by Tokomura H. , J Hepatobiliary Pancreat Surg (2002) 9:206–212, found less morbidity and shorter hospital stay in the transcystic approach compared to laparoscopic choledochotomy. The study found only one bile leakage (1%) in 91 patients with successful stone clearance. In the present manuscript there were 6 bile leakages (5.6%) in 107 patients with successful stone clearance. Another study from Waage, Surg Endosc (2003) 17: 1181–1185, founded one bile leakage in 110 patients (0.9%) using the transcystic approach .