

FIRST DEPARTMENT OF INTERNAL MEDICINE  
UNIVERSITY OF YAMANASHI

1110, SHIMOKATO, CHUO, YAMANASHI 409-3898, JAPAN

December 10, 2018

Prof. Dennis A Bloomfield  
Prof. Sandro Vento  
Editors-in-Chief  
*World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Shinichi Takano, et al; Manuscript ID: 43091

Dear Editors,

Thank you for reviewing our manuscript titled "**Risk factors for perforation during endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography in post-reconstruction intestinal tract.**"

Fortunately, our manuscript was of potential acceptance for publication in *World Journal of Clinical Cases* in the last submission. According to the comments from reviewers, we fully restructure our paper. Moreover, we corrected a format of ORCID number in the title page and added a background and article highlights in the abstract and after acknowledgments, respectively, according to the editor's indication.

We submitted all the requested documents except for video, grant application form, and supplementary material to which our study didn't have any relation.

We hope that the revised manuscript is suitable for reconsideration and that the explanations are satisfactory.

Yours sincerely,

Mitsuharu Fukasawa M.D. /Ph.D.  
First Department of Internal Medicine,  
Faculty of Medicine, University of  
Yamanashi  
1110, Shimokato, Chuo, Yamanashi  
409-3898, Japan.  
Tel: +81-55-273-9584  
Fax: +81-55-273-6748  
E-mail: fmitsu@yamanashi.ac.jp

**Responses to the Comments from Reviewer #1**

Reviewer's code: 02531403

We are grateful to Reviewer 1 for the critical comments and useful suggestions, which have helped us to improve our paper considerably. As indicated in the following responses, we have addressed all these comments and suggestions in the revised manuscript.

Comments from the Reviewer #1:

Dear authors, I read with interest manuscript n. 43091 about perforation during endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography in post-reconstruction intestinal tract. The title and the abstract reflect fully the main content of the study. The introduction is well structured. The materials & methods are well explained. The results are robust and supported by a well performed statistical analysis. The discussion is well argued. Figures are fully supporting the discussion.

Comments:

Comment 1)

I suggest to clarify the indications of the procedure in the 3 cases of perforation and to add a table describing all the variables concerning the 3 cases of perforation and how it was managed, eg like in a case series.

Response

Thank you for an important suggestion. We added Table 6 which describes clinical characteristics of three perforated cases with management after perforation according to the reviewer's suggestion. We also added an explanation for this table in the last sentence of the result section as follows "Clinical characteristics of all cases with perforation are shown in Table 6 and all these cases were adequately managed by conservative therapy or operation."

Comment 2)

I suggest to clarify why the procedure was not completed in 29% of cases.

## Response

Thank you for a good advice to improve our manuscript. As the reviewer suggested, we revised Table 2 to clarify causes of the procedure failure.

## **Responses to the Comments from Reviewer #2**

Reviewer's code: 02573214

We are grateful to Reviewer 2 for the critical comments and useful suggestions, which have helped us to improve our paper considerably. As indicated in the following responses, we have addressed all these comments and suggestions in the revised manuscript.

### Comments from the Reviewer #2:

In this manuscript the authors reported the results on the risk factors for perforation during endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography in post-reconstruction intestinal tract. They described a good number of clinical cases with interesting results. Although the manuscript is a retrospective study, this work is well set and represents a valid contribution.

## Response

Thank you for a favorable opinion of our manuscript. As the reviewer pointed out, this study has a limitation inherent to a retrospective study. We mentioned the limitation of this study, and also cited the results of a prospective study which implied the similar result as our study in the discussion part.