



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 44517

Title: Comparison of outcomes of endoscopic sphincterotomy vs open choledochotomy for common bile duct stones

Reviewer’s code: 03479389

Reviewer’s country: Japan

Science editor: Ruo-Yu Ma

Date sent for review: 2018-11-19

Date reviewed: 2018-11-19

Review time: 1 Hour

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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer’s expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> General
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a retrospective study. It is not considered which procedure to choose according to age or general condition. Please describe the incidence and severity of cholangitis before each treatment.



**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

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- Y] No

BPG Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- Y] No



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 44517

Title: Comparison of outcomes of endoscopic sphincterotomy vs open choledochotomy for common bile duct stones

Reviewer's code: 03646821

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Ruo-Yu Ma

Date sent for review: 2018-11-19

Date reviewed: 2018-11-21

Review time: 2 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	(High priority)	<input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> General
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors are to be congratulated for the fastidious follow-up of the 302 patients with CBD stones treated with either EST or OCT in this retrospective series. You rightfully mention that the absence of symptoms at follow-up does not mean that a subset of



**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

patients harbor asymptomatic ductal stones. 1. You note a higher rate of repeat endoscopic as opposed to open procedures. How many of those procedures were to remove a CBD stent if the patient had an intact GB with stones? Please add these numbers to the results and define whether additional cost or hospitalization time included stent retrieval. 2. Although the median length of hospital stay was lower for EST-treated patients, a 6-day hospital stay and a 3-day hospitalization prior to ERCP seem relatively long. Please comment. 3. I presume that all patients having OCT had open cholecystectomies. What percentage of patients undergoing EST had open as compared to laparoscopic gall bladder removal? Did this affect the cost equation? 4. Were all ERCPs successful other than the 6 patients in Figure 1 who did not achieve complete stone clearance? In other words, were the 168 patients in the EST group as well as the 134 patients in the OCT group actually subgroups in your institution? If so, this raises the question of selection bias that deserves comment. 5. The major issue from the reviewer's perspective is the comparison of patients treated with EST to those treated with OCT, a procedure that has given way to laparoscopic CBDE in most institutions. In fact, in the reviewer's institution we have not done OCT in a decade. This needs comment in the Discussion section.

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
- No



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 44517

Title: Comparison of outcomes of endoscopic sphincterotomy vs open choledochotomy for common bile duct stones

Reviewer's code: 03727100

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Ruo-Yu Ma

Date sent for review: 2018-11-19

Date reviewed: 2018-11-24

Review time: 5 Days

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you for valuable study. I suggest some points to make this academic paper better. Please revise if you can. 1. In page 5, line 13, patients with gallbladder stones who did not undergo a cholecystectomy were excluded from this study? 2. The method to



**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

measure distal CBD angulation should be shown by figure to recognize easily. 3. The description about Fig1 should be inserted in MATERIALS AND METHODS. 4. Many baselines of patient characteristics were statistically different between EST group and OCT group. Propensity score analysis should be used if you can. Patients are enough to perform propensity score analysis. 5. n (%) and median (IQR) were equivocal in Tables. 6. In table 4, CBDS recurrence patient number was 61 patients. Therefore, it is difficult to perform a logistic regression test for 14 items.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

BPG Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No