

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 6780

Title: Cannulation of the intradiverticular papilla using a duodenoscope: Is it a safe method?

Reviewer code: 00061678

Science editor: Cui, Xue-Mei

Date sent for review: 2013-10-30 10:34

Date reviewed: 2013-12-05 01:28

| CLASSIFICATION | LANGUAGE EVALUATION | RECOMMENDATION | CONCLUSION |
|--|---|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent) | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing | Google Search: | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good) | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> Existed | <input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> No records | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair) | | BPG Search: | <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor) | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected | <input type="checkbox"/> Existed | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> No records | |

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Editor, Authors Thanks, for sending Letter To the Editor "Cannulation of the intradiverticular papilla using a duodenoscope: Is it a safe method?" for revision. It is a good idea and reflect different experience but need great language revision.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 6780

Title: Cannulation of the intradiverticular papilla using a duodenoscope: Is it a safe method?

Reviewer code: 00503881

Science editor: Cui, Xue-Mei

Date sent for review: 2013-10-30 10:34

Date reviewed: 2013-12-10 01:19

| CLASSIFICATION | LANGUAGE EVALUATION | RECOMMENDATION | CONCLUSION |
|--|---|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent) | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing | Google Search: | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good) | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> Existed | <input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> No records | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair) | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected | <input type="checkbox"/> Existed | <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor) | | <input type="checkbox"/> No records | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision |

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The points raised in the letter are rather interesting but I have two points against its publication in the current format: 1) The arguments are not so conclusive: it would be interesting to extend the text and give more evidences; 2) The English is poor. Need to be revised.