

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**Manuscript NO:** 41053

**Title:** Ursodeoxycholic Acid Combined with Percutaneous Transhepatic Balloon Dilation for Management of Gallstones after Expulsion of Common Bile Duct Stones

**Reviewer's code:** 02975812

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Xue-Jiao Wang

**Date sent for review:** 2018-07-25

**Date reviewed:** 2018-08-02

**Review time:** 7 Days

| SCIENTIFIC QUALITY                                     | LANGUAGE QUALITY                                            | CONCLUSION                                 | PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS                      |
|--------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent            | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing       | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept            | Peer-Review:                                  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language | (High priority)                            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good                 | polishing                                                   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept | <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of           | (General priority)                         | Peer-reviewer's expertise on the              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not               | language polishing                                          | <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision    | topic of the manuscript:                      |
| publish                                                | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced  |
|                                                        |                                                             | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection         | <input type="checkbox"/> General              |
|                                                        |                                                             |                                            | <input type="checkbox"/> No expertise         |
|                                                        |                                                             |                                            | Conflicts-of-Interest:                        |
|                                                        |                                                             |                                            | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes                  |
|                                                        |                                                             |                                            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No        |

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this study, the authors evaluated the effectiveness and safety of combined ursodeoxycholic acid and percutaneous transhepatic balloon dilation for management of gallstones after removal of CBD stones. Totally 15 consecutive patients suffering from



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,  
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://** www.wjgnet.com

CBD stones associated with gallstones were evaluated. All subjects underwent repeated cholangiography, and percutaneous transhepatic removal was carried out in patients with secondary CBD stones originating from the gallbladder. All patients underwent percutaneous transhepatic balloon dilation with primary success rate of 100%. The combined therapy was successful in 86.7% of patients with concomitant CBD stones and gallstones. The procedure is described in detail. Overall, the manuscript is well designed and the results are clear and very interesting. The title reflects the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript. The manuscript describes methods in adequate detail, especially the procedure. The research objectives are achieved by the experiments used in this study. The authors found that for patient with concomitant CBD stones and gallstones, after percutaneous transhepatic removal of primary CBD stones, oral ursodeoxycholic acid and high-fat diet followed by percutaneous transhepatic removal of secondary CBD stones appear to be a feasible and effective option for management of gallstones after removal of CBD stones. Those findings are very important to the clinicians, and will guide the clinicians in the treatment of CBD stones. In this point, this study contributes a lot in the field. The manuscript needs editing, some blanks are missing. And some minor language polishing should be corrected.

## **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

### ***Google Search:***

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

### ***BPG Search:***



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,  
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242

**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243

**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

**https://**www.wjgnet.com

[ ] The same title

[ ] Duplicate publication

[ ] Plagiarism

[ Y ] No

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**Manuscript NO:** 41053

**Title:** Ursodeoxycholic Acid Combined with Percutaneous Transhepatic Balloon Dilation for Management of Gallstones after Expulsion of Common Bile Duct Stones

**Reviewer's code:** 03013758

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Xue-Jiao Wang

**Date sent for review:** 2018-07-25

**Date reviewed:** 2018-08-07

**Review time:** 12 Days

| SCIENTIFIC QUALITY                                     | LANGUAGE QUALITY                                            | CONCLUSION                                 | PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS                      |
|--------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept | Peer-Review:                                  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language | (High priority)                            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good                 | polishing                                                   | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept            | <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of           | (General priority)                         | Peer-reviewer's expertise on the              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not               | language polishing                                          | <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision    | topic of the manuscript:                      |
| publish                                                | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced  |
|                                                        |                                                             | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection         | <input type="checkbox"/> General              |
|                                                        |                                                             |                                            | <input type="checkbox"/> No expertise         |
|                                                        |                                                             |                                            | Conflicts-of-Interest:                        |
|                                                        |                                                             |                                            | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes                  |
|                                                        |                                                             |                                            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No        |

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Excellent study, combined ursodeoxycholic acid and percutaneous transhepatic balloon dilation is a very feasible and safe alternative for management of gallstones after removal of CBD stones. The manuscript is very well written, and the results are



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,  
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://** www.wjgnet.com

important and interesting. I have no specific comments to the authors, the manuscript seems enough for publication.

#### **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

##### ***Google Search:***

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

##### ***BPG Search:***

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**Manuscript NO:** 41053

**Title:** Ursodeoxycholic Acid Combined with Percutaneous Transhepatic Balloon Dilation for Management of Gallstones after Expulsion of Common Bile Duct Stones

**Reviewer's code:** 03017792

**Reviewer's country:** Japan

**Science editor:** Xue-Jiao Wang

**Date sent for review:** 2018-07-25

**Date reviewed:** 2018-08-08

**Review time:** 14 Days

| SCIENTIFIC QUALITY                                     | LANGUAGE QUALITY                                            | CONCLUSION                                 | PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS                      |
|--------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent            | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing       | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept            | Peer-Review:                                  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language | (High priority)                            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good                 | polishing                                                   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept | <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of           | (General priority)                         | Peer-reviewer's expertise on the              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not               | language polishing                                          | <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision    | topic of the manuscript:                      |
| publish                                                | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced  |
|                                                        |                                                             | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection         | <input type="checkbox"/> General              |
|                                                        |                                                             |                                            | <input type="checkbox"/> No expertise         |
|                                                        |                                                             |                                            | Conflicts-of-Interest:                        |
|                                                        |                                                             |                                            | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes                  |
|                                                        |                                                             |                                            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No        |

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

VERY INTERESTING STUDY. NO COMMENTS.

### INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,  
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://** www.wjgnet.com

*Google Search:*

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

*BPG Search:*

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No