

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Hepatology

**Manuscript NO:** 62703

**Title:** A retrospective analysis of complications related to Endoscopic Retrograde Cholangio-Pancreatography in patients with cirrhosis vs. patients without cirrhosis

**Reviewer's code:** 03646542

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Research Fellow, Surgeon

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

**Author's Country/Territory:** United States

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-01-26

**Reviewer chosen by:** Jin-Lei Wang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-01-27 11:02

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-01-27 11:52

**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 Grade E: Do not publish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

## **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Bernshteyn et al have submitted a retrospective study examining post-ERCP adverse events in cirrhotic vs non-cirrhotic patients. The manuscript is well-written, interesting and easy to read. I commend the authors for the work carried out, however, I have a few comments: Major comment: 1. Is there a reason why the authors did not use other statistical methods, e.g. logistic regression in order to test the hypothesis? Calculation odds ratios for different CP groups would be a nice addition to this work. Minor comments: 1. I suggest that you include page and line numbering in order to facilitate the review. 2. p-value 0.039 should be written as  $p=0.039$  and the significance level of 0.05 is already mentioned in the methods section, therefore it can be omitted when presenting individual p-values. 3. Please rephrase: “diagnosis-only” ERCP to diagnostic ERCP 4. I suggest that the discussion section is shortened. Start with the most important findings, compare with other recent publications and discuss pros and cons of the study design. 5. There are too many tables, several tables can be merged into one (tables 4-10, by transposing the rows and columns). In table 1, percentages presented under complications as misleading. I suggest calculating percentages based on all the patients in the group, not only those experiencing adverse events.