

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 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

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.