

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 76147

**Title:** A Prospective Single-center Feasible Study of Innovative Auto-release Bile duct Supporter to Delayed Adverse Events after Endoscopic Papillectomy

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05226178

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Professor, Director

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-03-05

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-03-07 04:07

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-03-11 02:03

**Review time:** 3 Days and 21 Hours

Scientific quality	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<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
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

**Peer-reviewer  
statements**Peer-Review: ☒ Anonymous ☐ OnymousConflicts-of-Interest: ☐ Yes ☒ No**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

This is a study aimed to evaluate the usefulness, convenience, safety and short-term results of a novel auto-release bile supporter after endoscopic papillectomy (EP) procedure. The authors concluded that auto-release bile supporter could decrease the frequency of procedure-associated complications. However this study was consisted of very small size of cases, and the wound was closed with hemoclips, fibrin glue was sprayed on the wound. So, the actual usefulness of the auto-release bile supporter is not clear.

1. The authors should alter the title as “ A prospective single-center feasible study of auto-release bile supporter to delayed adverse events after endoscopic snare papillectomy”
2. The authors use the term of endoscopic snare papillectomy (ESP) and endoscopic papillectomy (EP). I recommend to unify them and use the term of EP.
3. In table 1., the authors misspelled adenoma as adnoma in cases 1 and 4.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 76147

**Title:** A Prospective Single-center Feasible Study of Innovative Auto-release Bile duct Supporter to Delayed Adverse Events after Endoscopic Papillectomy

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 02548230

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** FASGE, MD, MSc, PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-03-05

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-03-14 19:27

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-03-15 14:36

**Review time:** 19 Hours

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

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: [ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] Anonymous [ <input type="radio"/> ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ <input type="radio"/> ] Yes [ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] No
-------------------------------------	---

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? Yes, the title reflects and highlights the authors' hypothesis regarding the study. 2 Summary. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? yes 3 Keywords. Do the keywords reflect the focus of the manuscript? yes 4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, current status and importance of the study? yes 5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (eg, experiments, data analysis, research and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? Yes, it does, but it's kind of confusing about the ideal time to implant the new device and where they put it, was it in the pancreas or in the bile duct? 6 Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study? What contributions has the study made to the progress of research in this field? For the authors, the interposition of this device was essential to avoid the complications of PE that reach more than 20%. In this study, the authors report that there were no complications. To verify this hypothesis, authors should evaluate a larger number of cases. 7 Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and adequately, highlighting key points concisely, clearly and logically? Are the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated clearly and defined? Is the discussion accurate and does it sufficiently discuss the article's scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice? Yes, initially because a series of cases can be considered difficult, but that can be treated as a series of patients can be considered difficult. 8 Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, of good quality and adequately illustrate the content of the article? Do figures require labeling with arrows, asterisks, etc., better captions? Figure 1 is very confusing, it



**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>

should be more didactic. 9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? No 10 units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements for using SI units? No 11 References. Does the manuscript adequately cite the most recent, important, and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections? Does the author cite, omit, misquote, and/or overcite references? No