



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

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

**Manuscript NO:** 81997

**Title:** Comprehensive review on small common bile duct stones

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 03845526

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Chief Doctor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-12-01

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-12-05 12:46

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-12-09 13:14

**Review time:** 4 Days

<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 Grade E: Do not publish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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

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

statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [ <b>Y</b> ] No
------------	--

### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

This review analyze the pros and cons of EPBD and EST for CBD small stones retrieval comprehensively, combined guidelines with updated literatures. Here are some questions about this article. 1. The author defined small stones as less than 10mm in diameter. I recommend to stratify the small stones with two subgroups, less than 5mm and 5-10mm, and analyze respectively Since ESBD or EPBD is not always in need in patients with stones less than 5mm. But on the flip side, EPBD or ESBD will be conducted routinely in 5-10mm stones. 2. Some literatures compared the pressure of short term and long term SO between EPBD and EST, which was associated with the recurrence of CBD stones. So relevant contents are suggested to complement. 3. There was three techniques for small stones less than 10mm, including EST, EPBD, ESBD. The indication for these techniques are supposed to clarified and specified. 4. Distal biliary stricture accompanied by proximal bile duct dilation is a specific situation. How to retrieve stones and what should be selected, EST or EPBD, or ESBD, should be discussed. 5. In one sentence, ESBD was typed as ESBE by mistake. Please correct it.



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 81997

**Title:** Comprehensive review on small common bile duct stones

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 06468659

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-12-01

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-01-06 04:05

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-01-07 13:35

**Review time:** 1 Day and 9 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Novelty of this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
<b>Creativity or innovation of this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation



<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<b>Language quality</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input 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>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**

This study by Sakue Masuda(MD, MS) and colleagues is very meaningful and useful. The authors have reviewed the treatment progress of small common bile duct stones, especially about EPBD and EST. However, I may ask a few questions about this manuscript. 1. As the title "A comprehensive review on small common bile duct stones" said, would you please demonstrate some research outcomes of laparoscopic/choledochoscopic treatment on small common bile duct stones. 2.If possible, Would you please add a new table about the incidence and treatments of short-term and long-term complications of EPBD/EST; 3. In "Abstract", line 3, change the word "Indications" to "indications". 4.At page 12, line 8, please change the abbreviation "ESBE" to "ESBD".