

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

Manuscript NO: 81056

Title: External use of mirabilite to prevent post-endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography pancreatitis in children: A multicenter randomized controlled trial

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03722267

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-11-08

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-11-09 23:44

Reviewer performed review: 2022-11-14 05:38

Review time: 4 Days and 5 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection

Re-review	[<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] Anonymous [<input type="checkbox"/>] Onymous
statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [<input type="checkbox"/>] Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a multicenter randomized controlled trial to examine the usefulness of external use of Mirabilite to prevent PEP. This study is interesting. However, there are some concerns to be mentioned. 1) Pre-study calculation of sample size is essential because of a RCT. Did the authors perform sample size calculation in this study? 2) The authors should show how to use Mirabilite clearly in a Figure. 3) Does the endoscopist, who performed ERCP procedures in this study, really have 30,000 ERCP experiences?

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

Manuscript NO: 81056

Title: External use of mirabilite to prevent post-endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography pancreatitis in children: A multicenter randomized controlled trial

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06195132

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: N/A

Professional title: N/A

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Bangladesh

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-11-08

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-11-08 18:07

Reviewer performed review: 2022-11-21 06:37

Review time: 12 Days and 12 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input 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	Peer-Review: [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] Anonymous [<input type="checkbox"/>] Onymous
statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [<input type="checkbox"/>] Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript is well written, and the title reflect the main subject of the manuscript. Discussion is adequate and consistent with the finding. New and effective preventive measure to prevent PEP will of course open a new thinking and scope of further research in this sphere. However, I would like to suggest few corrections. 1. For the diagnosis of PEP, while doing imaging, CT is an option, especially in severe cases to rule out perforation (as per the consensus paper author referenced no 18). In the series, none required CT, it is astonishing while author encountered few severe cases. But they did CT as routine preprocedural procedure. 2. Author could Cannulate in all cases (100%), that is another astonishing point. 3. The incidence of PEP is higher in the blank group, author should find out other research work having such higher incidence specially in Asia region. (Please add the reference titled " Post-ERCP pancreatitis: Frequency and risk stratification from four tertiary care referral hospitals in South East Asia" PMID: 36042621 PMCID: PMC9410617 DOI: 10.1097/MD.00000000000030271 4. There is wide variation in the definition for the diagnosis of PEP, some even considered serum lipase and amylase 5 times of upper limit of normal value. That might be a reason of higher PEP, as the author considered 3 times as per the consensus. Its Ok i think but this wide variation might be mentioned with reference (this reference might help, doi: 10.4103/ijabmr.ijabmr_192_21, PMID: 34912687 PMCID: PMC8633690, " Role of 4-H Serum Lipase Level in Predicting Postendoscopic retrograde Cholangiopancreatography Pancreatitis").

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

Manuscript NO: 81056

Title: External use of mirabilite to prevent post-endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography pancreatitis in children: A multicenter randomized controlled trial

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03722267

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-11-08

Reviewer chosen by: Jing-Jie Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-12-25 00:10

Reviewer performed review: 2022-12-26 02:57

Review time: 1 Day and 2 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



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

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 manuscript is well revised.