



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

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

**Manuscript NO:** 60883

**Title:** Could saline irrigation clear all residual common bile duct stones after lithotripsy?  
A self-controlled prospective cohort study

**Reviewer’s code:** 00504215

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Professor

**Reviewer’s Country/Territory:** Japan

**Author’s Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-11-22

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-11-23 00:10

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-11-23 06:06

**Review time:** 5 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**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

## **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

The article deals with very interesting topic associated with saline irrigation after complete removal of choledochal stones confirmed by cholangiographic imaging. I guess, however, there are some points to be modified. The protocol of cholangiographic evaluation and irrigation procedure seems to be difficult to understand. Description of the protocol should be clearly described in order to make you method easier to understand. In addition, as the study dealt only with the subject who underwent lithotripsy, it should be clearly mentioned not only in 'Introduction' but also in 'Material and methods'. Further, I encourage the authors to add a flow chart showing the protocol of evaluation and irrigation procedures. The authors mention, 'The CBD clearance score was assessed by two blinded endoscopists.' How did you determine a final score for each evaluation? Please explain. What about the reproducibility of CBD clearance score by two evaluators? Acute cholangitis has long been diagnosed on the basis of Charcot's triad. However, Charcot's triad has significant problem with a low sensitivity [1]. Thus, TG13 [1] has been more widely used as a criterion for acute cholangitis in many studies. [1] Kiriya S et al. J Hepatobiliary Pancreat Sci 2013; 20: 24-34. The use of cholangioscopy and saline irrigation is reportedly a risk factor of cholangitis after ERCP. Some previous reports indicated the efficacy of antibiotic for reducing the risk of cholangitis. The use of antibiotics, including prophylactic use should be mentioned in the text. Please explain the method of lithotripsy for patients participating the present study. Did any patients undergo cholangioscopic lithotripsy with laser and/or EHL? Please mention the situation. If you failed to stone clearance with a saline of 100 ml, saline irrigation continued until getting the score 5. Please include more information about the patients required additional irrigation over 100 ml. How much saline solution did they need for complete clearance? Your conclusion includes patients with PAD



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

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

and/or a dilated CBD may not completely clear residual choledochal stones after lithotripsy. What is possible reason for more necessary irrigation for complete clearance in patients with such condition? Please discuss. Your last assessment, the correlation between the compositions of stones and variables, is not related to the main topic and appears to be redundant. I think the last assessment should be eliminated from the study.



## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 60883

**Title:** Could saline irrigation clear all residual common bile duct stones after lithotripsy?  
A self-controlled prospective cohort study

**Reviewer's code:** 00504215

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Japan

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-11-22

**Reviewer chosen by:** Chen-Chen Gao

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-12-14 00:37

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-12-14 05:54

**Review time:** 5 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

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

Thank you for you correcting your paper. It is revised accordingly and became easier to understand. However, only one more revision is required as indicated below. P.8, L.12 'SpyGlass' (Boston Scientific Corporation, Marlborough, Massachusetts, USA) should be 'SpyGlass DS'.



### PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 60883

**Title:** Could Saline Irrigation Clear All Residual Common Bile Duct (CBD) Stones After Lithotripsy? a self-controlled prospective cohort study

**Reviewer's code:** 03491558

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Adjunct Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Italy

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-11-22

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-11-23 09:15

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-11-23 10:28

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**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

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

I thank the editor in chief for assigning me the revision of this paper. It deals with a subject of considerable importance. As the authors pointed out in the introduction, the management of incomplete gallbladder removal following open and laparoscopic techniques has been addressed in several studies. Although the author submitted a well-written paper I struggle to find original findings. One aspect that I have doubts about is the structure of the paper. The authors, in fact, after having 'built a score' apply it to the evaluation of CBD. Perhaps this artifice needed to be better explained. Another concern: What was the irrigation pressure? High pressure can induce/precipitate cholangitis. While the proposed technique appears to be effective, the authors themselves point out that the approach cannot be routinely used as 'with the SpyGlass DS increases the procedure time with additional costs'. This approach allowed to demonstrate the study hypothesis but limits the quality and importance of this manuscript. In brief: the article is well written and confirms that good irrigation is effective to improve CBD clearance especially in case of biliary tract dilation or PAD. What is the novelty?