

Dear Editor and Reviewers,

Thanks very much for taking your time to review this manuscript

"Ectopic opening of the common bile duct into the duodenal bulb with recurrent choledocholithiasis: A case report" (NO: 65082). I really appreciate all your comments and suggestions! Please find my itemized responses in below and my revisions/corrections in the re-submitted files.

Thanks again!

Reviewer #1(Reviewer's code: 05563631):

Scientific Quality: Grade E (Do not publish)

Language Quality: Grade C (A great deal of language polishing)

Conclusion: Major revision

Specific Comments to Authors: The findings of your manuscript are original and interesting however the english Language must be carefully revised and some concepts in the text are not clear or well described.

We are grateful for this important comment. We have carefully revised the english Language and some concepts.

Reviewer #2(Reviewer's code: 00504187):

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: This report is an interesting description of a rare ectopic opening of the common bile duct, worth of publishing. English style can be improved. However, while the description of the case is detailed and precise, the discussion is really too exhaustive, especially considering that it is a case report. Discussion should attain mainly practical problems and difficulties during management and not be a review of the literature. References are appropriate and updated. Figure 3 may be avoided, as does not add anything to the case.

We are grateful for this important comment.

1. We have carefully revised the english Language.
2. The cholangioenterostomy for patients is a very routine and mature operation. This is not a difficult point. What is difficult is the decision-making on the ectopic opening of the common bile duct. Because there is currently no relevant consensus or guidelines, So we focused on the possible causes and surgical decision-making.
3. Figure 3 is mainly to show the location of the ectopic common bile duct opening, the common bile duct stones and the operation method, and to directly verify the preoperative imaging results.

Reviewer #3(Reviewer's code: 02954510):

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: The manuscript (number: 65082) entitled

“Ectopic opening of the common bile duct into the duodenal bulb with recurrent choledocholithiasis: A case report” has been reviewed. 1. Title is reflect the main subject. 2. Abstract section is sufficient. 3. Keywords are reflect the focus. 4. Background is adequately. 5. Case presentation is well designated. 6. Although the discussion section is sufficient, it should be shortened by focusing on the purpose. Much literature information is included like review article. 7. References is appropriate. 8. Manuscript is well organized. The article is generally well organized and can contribute to the literature. However, some minor corrections are required.

We are grateful for this important comment.

1. We have carefully revised the text.
2. The cholangioenterostomy for patients is a very routine and mature operation. This is not a difficult point. What is difficult is the decision-making on the ectopic opening of the common bile duct. Because there is currently no relevant consensus or guidelines, So we focused on the possible causes and surgical decision-making.

Reviewer #4(Reviewer's code: 02562249):

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: It is important to include in the paper published outcomes of the surgical treatment of ectopic opening of the common bile duct.

[We thank you for your very important comment.](#)

We are very grateful for your and reviewers' warm work earnestly. In all, we found the reviewers' comments are quite helpful. They point the deficiencies about our manuscript us, also the aspects that we have not done enough. It plays an important role in guiding for our future research, and helps us for further improvement.

We have tried our best to improve the manuscript and made extensive modification in the original manuscript according to the comments. These changes will not influence the content and framework of the paper.

Thank you and the reviewers again for your help, and hope that the correction will meet with approval.