

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 67638

Title: Common Bile Duct Morphology Is Associated With Recurrence Of Common Bile Duct Stones In Billroth II Anatomy Patients

Reviewer's code: 02461932

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-04-29

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-04-29 08:16

Reviewer performed review: 2021-04-29 13:03

Review time: 4 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input 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

The authors investigated whether CBD morphology and other predictors affecting CBD stone recurrence and found that CBD morphology, especially S type and polyline type, was associated with increased recurrence of CBD stones in Billroth II anatomy patients. The manuscript was well-written and documented. The study is sound and the results might be useful in clinical practice. Minor point: Please add the number of patients in the abstract.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 67638

Title: Common Bile Duct Morphology Is Associated With Recurrence Of Common Bile Duct Stones In Billroth II Anatomy Patients

Reviewer's code: 05204667

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree:

Professional title:

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Reviewer_Country

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-04-29

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-04-29 16:43

Reviewer performed review: 2021-05-02 18:58

Review time: 3 Days and 2 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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

This single center retrospective study evaluated the risk factors associated with recurrence of CBD stones in patients with Billroth II anastomosis, with focusing on the morphology of the CBD. The authors concluded that S-type and polyline type were associated with the recurrence of CBD stones, however, I think that the definition of CBD morphology is ambiguous. The CBD morphology in Figure 5 looks like an S type rather than polyline. It is questionable whether it is necessary to distinguish between S type and polyline type. The authors are needed to define the classification of CBD morphology more specifically. How could the authors check for complete CBD stone removal at first ERCP? It seems difficult to distinguish between residual stone with recurrence. The authors should address the interval between first ERCP and recurrence. How many patients had GB stones at the time of first ERCP? How many cholecystectomy was done during the f/u period? The analysis in Table 5 seems to be meaningless because the sample size is too small. The flow diagram of study population is required.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 67638

Title: Common Bile Duct Morphology Is Associated With Recurrence Of Common Bile Duct Stones In Billroth II Anatomy Patients

Reviewer's code: 03647881

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Attending Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Taiwan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-04-29

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-05-01 04:33

Reviewer performed review: 2021-05-05 23:29

Review time: 4 Days and 18 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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

No special comments, thanks.