

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 33944

Title: Feasibility of initial endoscopic common bile duct stone removal in patients with acute cholangitis

Reviewer's code: 00503601

Reviewer's country: Singapore

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2017-03-16

Date reviewed: 2017-03-17

| CLASSIFICATION | LANGUAGE EVALUATION | SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT | CONCLUSION |
|---|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing | Google Search: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept |
| <input 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 checked="" 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 | | [Y] No | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision |
| | | BPG Search: | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism | |
| | | [Y] No | |

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Comparison of urgent CBD stone removal by ERCP at 1st ERCP versus delayed stone removal as a response to changes in the Japanese management guidelines. On page 12, last paragraph is there a typo error on the reasons for not doing additional EST? Should "...an off-period of more than 5-7 days" be corrected to "...an off-period of less than 5-7 days"?

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 33944

Title: Feasibility of initial endoscopic common bile duct stone removal in patients with acute cholangitis

Reviewer's code: 03700188

Reviewer's country: Brazil

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2017-05-05

Date reviewed: 2017-05-15

| 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism | <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor | | [Y] No | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision |
| | | BPG Search: | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism | |
| | | [Y] No | |

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Although this is a small study, it was well written. We need bigger study to come to a conclusion, but I found this one a beginning.