



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

**Manuscript NO:** 35734

**Title:** Imaging of gall bladder by Endoscopic ultrasound

**Reviewer's code:** 01438495

**Reviewer's country:** Japan

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2017-08-04

**Date reviewed:** 2017-08-30

**Review time:** 26 Days

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" 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

The manuscript is well written, but "the fundus of stomach" as the site for operating the endoscope is better to be described as "the body of stomach".

Reply: Thanks for your comments. We respect that but fundus is the site of operating the endoscope and hence, unfortunately we cannot change. We apologize for that.



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy  
**Manuscript NO:** 35734  
**Title:** Imaging of gall bladder by Endoscopic ultrasound  
**Reviewer’s code:** 01047625  
**Reviewer’s country:** Taiwan  
**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji  
**Date sent for review:** 2017-09-07  
**Date reviewed:** 2017-09-17  
**Review time:** 10 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**

The authors conducted a detailed review of linear EUS imaging techniques of gallbladder. This manuscript is generally nicely written; however, I have a minor concern to this manuscript. 1. As described in this manuscript, the only station which may not reproduce the gallbladder images is from the duodenal bulb. Please discuss more about this point and the authors may show some cases.

Reply: Thanks for your suggestion. We have already discussed this point in the manuscript as follows “This difference in reproducing the images and a great variability of images comes mainly due to the variability of the position of scope (short loop, or J shaped position) in the duodenal bulb”.



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy  
**Manuscript NO:** 35734  
**Title:** Imaging of gall bladder by Endoscopic ultrasound  
**Reviewer’s code:** 00503883  
**Reviewer’s country:** Brazil  
**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji  
**Date sent for review:** 2017-09-07  
**Date reviewed:** 2017-09-19  
**Review time:** 12 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 checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" 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**

Article addresses a very interesting issue. Good review paper with excellent quality images, tables and adequate literature review. Minor grammatical errors.

**Reply:** Thanks for reviewing our manuscript. We have tried to correct minor grammatical errors in the revised manuscript.