

March 13, 2021

Dr. Lian-Sheng Ma
The Editor in Chief
World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Dear Dr. Lian-Sheng Ma

Re: Manuscript 62191

We would like to thank the reviewers for their time and their effort in reviewing our manuscript. We have read the reviewers' constructive criticisms and made the necessary corrections.

We would like to re-submit a revised version of our manuscript with the corrections made in bold type and also listed below point-by-point:

Reviewer #1 commented: The title refers to a "systematic review". Actually, the authors conducted an original study and a systematic review at the same time. The systematic review analysis was used to calculate the global prevalence, therefore, I suggested it would be more helpful to remove "systematic review" in the title. The core information should be reflected in the title.

In keeping with the reviewer's suggestion, the phrase "Systematic Review" has been removed from the manuscript title.

Reviewer #1 commented: There is confusion about the unselected people in the introduction, and what's the meaning of unselected people?

We were attempting to state that all consecutive patients who had MRCP were evaluated in this study. However, we understand the confusion using the term "unselected people" in the introduction. Therefore, we have removed the phrase "unselected people" in the introduction as this explanation already appears in the methods section, where it is more appropriate to state it.

Reviewer #1 commented: For a high-quality systematic literature study, detailed inclusion and excluded criteria according to PICO(s) principles should be provided.

In keeping with the reviewer's suggestion, we have listed the detailed inclusion and exclusion criteria. There are two new sentences to explain this in the methods section, paragraph 7, lines 5-6. The sentences detail that the "Inclusion criteria were: case series reporting >15 cases, reports with detailed descriptions of variants, studies in adults > 18 years of age and those using MRCP imaging to detect ductal anatomy." This also states

that the “exclusion criteria were duplicated publications, individual case reports and small series with less than 15 cases.”

Reviewer #1 commented: The reference about the definition of the global prevalence should be given.

A new citation for the definition of global prevalence has now been included as reference #4. And this appears in the text in the methods section, paragraph 5 at line 9.

Reviewer #1 commented: Result: although some authors utilized different classifications, detailed review of the published descriptions and images within the published articles allowed us to extrapolate data for comparisons. When the variant was not reported or could not be reliably extrapolated from published descriptions, data and/or images, the study data were excluded from the global prevalence statistics. This part should be placed in the method.

We agree with the reviewer that this information would flow better if placed in the methods section. Therefore, the sentence has been omitted from the results section and instead moved to the methods section, paragraph 5 at lines 7-9.

Reviewer #1 commented: The authors compared the merits and demerits of the different classification systems in the discussion. The authors should explain that why they selected Huang et al classification to classify biliary anatomy in the discussion.

In the general medical literature, the classification proposed by Huang et al was the most commonly utilized system. Therefore, we used the Huang classification to characterize variations encountered in our population. This is now stated in the methods section at paragraph 3, lines 1-2 and it is mentioned again in the discussion section at paragraph 3, lines 4-6.

Reviewer #2 commented: This research focused on Anatomic Variations of the Intra-Hepatic Biliary Tree in the Caribbean: A systematic review, very interesting topic. In Table 1 and 2 you cited many references from other countries, but why not cited the China condition of Anatomic Variations of the Intra-Hepatic Biliary Tree, because the chinese population so much and hepatic disease patients so many.

We thank reviewer 2 for their kind comments. We acknowledge that there are many persons with hepatic diseases in the Chinese population. However, when we performed a systematic review, we encountered thirteen articles from Asian countries including Taiwan, South Korea and Japan, but we did not encounter any studies that originated from China. This is why there are no Chinese studies included in the tables.

Science editor commented: Scientific quality: The manuscript describes a systematic review of the anatomic variations of the intra-hepatic biliary tree in the Caribbean. The topic is within the scope of the WJGE.

No action required.

Science editor commented: Summary of the Peer-Review Report: The authors reported a well-written and interesting paper. However, some important issues should be clarified and improved. The questions raised by the reviewers should be answered;

All queries raised by the reviewer have been addressed as listed above.

Science editor commented: Format: There are 2 tables and 5 figures.

No action required.

Science editor commented: A total of 62 references are cited, including 4 references published in the last 3 years.

No action required.

Science editor commented: There are 10 self-cited references. The self-referencing rates should be less than 10%. Please keep the reasonable self-citations that are closely related to the topic of the manuscript, and remove other improper self-citations. If the authors fail to address the critical issue of self-citation, the editing process of this manuscript will be terminated

The majority of self-cited citations have been removed and only those that are closely related to the topic remain. Therefore, the number of citations has been reduced to 55 and there are now 3 self-citations (5.5%) within the manuscript.

Science editor commented: References recommend: The authors have the right to refuse to cite improper references recommended by peer reviewer(s), especially the references published by the peer reviewer(s) themselves. If the authors found the peer reviewer(s) request the authors to cite improper references published by themselves, please send the peer reviewer's ID number to the editorialoffice@wjgnet.com. The Editorial Office will close and remove the peer reviewer from the F6Publishing system immediately.

The reviewers have not asked for any references to be changed and they have made no suggestions on additional references to be included. Therefore, no action is required.

Science editor commented: Language evaluation: Classification: Grade B and Grade B. A language editing certificate issued by AJE was provided.

No action required.

Science editor commented: Academic norms and rules: The authors need to provide the PRISMA 2009 Checklist with page number. No academic misconduct was found in the Bing search.

A PRISMA 2009 checklist has been completed for this manuscript.

Science editor commented: Supplementary comments: This is an invited manuscript. No financial support was obtained for the study. The topic has not previously been published in the WJGE.

No action required.

Science editor commented: Issues raised: (1) The authors did not provide original pictures. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor;

Original figures are uploaded to the publishing system. We have provided decomposable (whose parts are all movable and editable) and organized them into a single PowerPoint file. The power point file is named "62191-Figures.ppt." The figures were uploaded to the file destination of "Image File".

Science editor commented: Issues raised: (2) The "Article Highlights" section is missing. Please add the "Article Highlights" section at the end of the main text. 6 Recommendation: Conditional acceptance.

The Article Highlights section has been added after the main text / conclusion. This contains a new paragraph to describe the highlights.

Company editor-in-chief commented: I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, the full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors. Before final acceptance, uniform presentation should be used for figures showing the same or

similar contents; for example, “Figure 1Pathological changes of atrophic gastritis after treatment. A: ...; B: ...; C: ...; D: ...; E: ...; F: ...; G: ...”.

We thank the editor in chief for these comments. As suggested, the images now have a uniform presentation. All duct structures identified in the images have uniform labels and the figure legends all begin with a description of the anatomic variant type.

Editor-in-chief asked for tables to be resubmitted.

We have provided decomposable Tables (whose parts are all movable and editable). The two tables are organized into a single Word file named “62191-Tables.docx.” WE have uploaded the document with a file destination of “Table File”.

We hope that the revised manuscript meets the requirements for final acceptance and publication.

Best regards
Shamir Cawich