

3 SCIENTIFIC QUALITY

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Major revision

Specific Comments to Authors: This is a nicely written review of an interesting topic with minor typos and misspellings that need to be corrected. although it tackles an interesting topic, it seems to only reassure and confirm what has been recently published in several guidelines and other authors, placing its originality and novelty as borderline. Figueres and tables are well used and achieved.

Dear Reviewer, thank you for your comment. The purpose of a review is to show the state of art of the topic. In fact, we focused on the endoscopic management of difficult biliary duct stones in patients with and without altered anatomy presenting the new approaches in this topic and we also dedicated a subtitle to the future research directions. In details, we highlighted the use of the cholangioscopy as the first line treatment in difficult CBD stones including the percutaneous transhepatic access and the role of the EUS guided interventions. Finally, the goal of the review is not only to summarize the results of the published studies but also to identify the grey zone in order to promote new studies. Moreover we confirm that the manuscript has been reviewed by a native English speaker.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: The manuscript titled as 'Endoscopic management of difficult common bile duct stones: where are we now? A comprehensive review' was reviewed. The authors presented management of bile duct stones for complex situations such as patients has a history of B- 2 Reconstruction. All subtitles appropriately summarized the subject. The authors should add a subtitle for liver transplant patients.

Dear Reviewer, thank you for your suggestion. We took it into account adding a subtitle dedicated to the endoscopic management of biliary duct stones in post-liver transplantation.

6 EDITORIAL OFFICE'S COMMENTS

Authors must revise the manuscript according to the Editorial Office's comments and suggestions, which are listed below:

(1) Science editor: 1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes an Opinion Review of the Difficult bile duct stones: endoscopic management. The topic is within the scope of the WJG. (1) Classification: Grade B and Grade C;

Dear Science editor, thank you for your comment.

(2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: This is a nicely written review of an interesting topic. All subtitles appropriately summarized the subject. The authors should add a subtitle for liver transplant patients. The questions raised by the reviewers should be answered;

Dear Science editor, thank you for your comment. As reviewers suggested, we added a subtitle for liver transplant patients and we believe we have clearly and fully replied to their questions.

(3) Format: There is 1 table and 4 figures;

Dear Science editor, we prepared separated files in ppt format for figures and a separated file in word format for the table.

(4) References: A total of 108 references are cited, including 30 references published in the last 3 years;

(5) Self-cited references: There are 5 self-cited references.

2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade A and Grade B. The manuscript is reviewed by a native English speaker.

Dear Science editor, thank you for your comment. We confirm that the manuscript has been reviewed by a native English speaker.

3 Academic norms and rules: No academic misconduct was found in the Bing search. 4 Supplementary comments: This is an invited manuscript. No financial support was obtained for the study. The topic has not previously been published in the WJG.

5 Issues raised: (1) The authors did not provide original pictures. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor; and (2) Please confirm if the figures are original. If an author of a submission is re-using a figure or figures published elsewhere, or that is copyrighted, the author must provide documentation that the previous publisher or copyright holder has given permission for the figure to be re-published; and correctly indicating the reference source and copyrights. For example, "Figure 1 Histopathological examination by hematoxylin-eosin staining (200 ×). A: Control group; B: Model group; C: Pioglitazone hydrochloride group; D: Chinese herbal medicine group. Citation: Yang JM, Sun Y, Wang M, Zhang XL, Zhang SJ, Gao YS, Chen L, Wu MY, Zhou L, Zhou YM, Wang Y, Zheng FJ, Li YH. Regulatory effect of a Chinese herbal medicine formula on non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. World J Gastroenterol 2019; 25(34): 5105-5119. Copyright ©The Author(s) 2019. Published by Baishideng Publishing Group Inc[6]". And please cite the reference source in the references list. If the author fails to properly cite the published or copyrighted picture(s) or table(s) as described above, he/she will be subject to withdrawal of the article from BPG publications and may even be held liable. 6 Recommendation: Conditional acceptance.

Dear Science editor, thank you for your comment. We confirm that pictures are original and we arranged them using PowerPoint following the given instructions.

(2) Company editor-in-chief: I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Gastroenterology, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors.

Dear Company editor-in-chief, thank you for your comment. We did our best to satisfy the World Journal of Gastroenterology requirements.