

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

Manuscript NO: 88547

Title: Risk factors for recurrence of common bile duct stones after surgical treatment and effect of ursodeoxycholic acid intervention

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 07746181

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Doctor, Research Associate

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-11-03

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-11-07 09:25

Reviewer performed review: 2023-11-14 08:51

Review time: 6 Days and 23 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 Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<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

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

Researcher retrospectively studied patients who underwent ERCP for choledocholithiasis, with a special emphasis on the use of UDCA. The main findings of this study were as follows: (1) Prophylactic use of UDCA after ERCP helps reduce intrahepatic bile stasis, promotes hepatic function recovery, and effectively reduces the rate of stone recurrence. (2) Parapapillary diverticulum, number of stones > 3, positive bile culture, and maximum stone diameter are independent correlates of increased recurrence rates after ERCP in patients with choledochal stones. Postoperative UDCA level was found to be a preventive factor. This study providing new research directions and references for the prevention and treatment of stone recurrence. This research design is reasonable and the results are credible. My suggestion is that it would be better to provide a more detailed description of the results.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

Manuscript NO: 88547

Title: Risk factors for recurrence of common bile duct stones after surgical treatment and effect of ursodeoxycholic acid intervention

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 07746604

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Germany

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-11-03

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-11-06 09:46

Reviewer performed review: 2023-11-14 10:29

Review time: 8 Days

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
Novelty of this manuscript	<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
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<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

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<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
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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	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 manuscript analyzed the risk factors for choledocholithiasis recurrence after ERCP retrograde cholangiopancreatography and the effect of UDCA intervention. The results shown that the intervention effect of UDCA after ERCP for common bile duct stones is adequate. The manuscript is very well written, had clinical significance and was helpful in understanding the treatment of gallstones. Also, the figures and tables help the readers to make a more understanding of the study. The whole manuscript is well drafted. However, I still have a few suggestions to improve this manuscript. Figure legends should express the results more clearly. Your manuscript needs careful editing and particular attention to English grammar, spelling, and sentence structure.