



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Manuscript NO: 37202

Title: Comparison between endoscopic sphincterotomy versus endoscopic sphincterotomy associated with balloon dilation for removal of bile duct stones: a systematic review and meta-analysis based on randomized controlled trials.

Reviewer's code: 00722601

Reviewer's country: Spain

Science editor: Li-Jun Cui

Date sent for review: 2017-11-21

Date reviewed: 2017-11-21

Review time: 13 Hours

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear authors, take into account these recommendations: Abstract: -methods: please make it shorter. -results: don't add discussions, only results -Conclusion: write more clear. Introduction: paragraph 3: remove "to the best of our knowledge. Remove "1230 patients", this is a result. Last paragraph is about discussion, remove from introduction. Outcomes: dont repeat data table/text. Discussion: start this point with the response to your principal objective. A lot of results are repeated. There is a poor discussion about the utility of results in clinical practice, and about recommendations of previous reviews. Put the limitations near the end of the discussion.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Manuscript NO: 37202

Title: Comparison between endoscopic sphincterotomy versus endoscopic sphincterotomy associated with balloon dilation for removal of bile duct stones: a systematic review and meta-analysis based on randomized controlled trials.

Reviewer's code: 03026750

Reviewer's country: Egypt

Science editor: Li-Jun Cui

Date sent for review: 2017-11-21

Date reviewed: 2017-11-25

Review time: 4 Days

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Well written manuscript. However, i have some comments: 1. The last 2 paragraphs in the introduction seems inappropriate here. i think better to be in methods. 2. For the discussion, you did not talk about the previous recommendations of this review articles and finally to summarize your recommendations after the meta analysis. 3. Limitations of the study should be at the end of the discussion.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Manuscript NO: 37202

Title: Comparison between endoscopic sphincterotomy versus endoscopic sphincterotomy associated with balloon dilation for removal of bile duct stones: a systematic review and meta-analysis based on randomized controlled trials.

Reviewer's code: 00504581

Reviewer's country: Spain

Science editor: Li-Jun Cui

Date sent for review: 2017-11-21

Date reviewed: 2017-12-01

Review time: 10 Days

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> [] High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

it is a very interesting and well done study, with a very large number of patients included, only except the number of patients with choledocolithiasis greater than 15 mm and the heterogeneity of this group . Despite of the fact of the non great number of patients with choledocolithiasis larger than 15 mm.However , this result allows the reader to get the idea that perhaps the final results were not going to change a lot if the studies would have included a greater N of patients it is surprising the small number of perforations found on the randomized studies included



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Manuscript NO: 37202

Title: Comparison between endoscopic sphincterotomy versus endoscopic sphincterotomy associated with balloon dilation for removal of bile duct stones: a systematic review and meta-analysis based on randomized controlled trials.

Reviewer’s code: 01800530

Reviewer’s country: India

Science editor: Li-Jun Cui

Date sent for review: 2017-11-21

Date reviewed: 2017-12-04

Review time: 13 Days

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this manuscript entitled as “Comparison between endoscopic sphincterotomy versus endoscopic sphincterotomy associated with balloon dilation for removal of bile duct stones: a systematic review and meta-analysis based on randomized controlled trials”, the authors analyzed the outcomes of endoscopic sphincterotomy (ES) vs endoscopic sphincterotomy and balloon dilatation combined (ESBD) in nine randomized studies. The manuscript addresses an important question and is relevant to the readers. I have the following comments to make: Major points 1. What is new in this systematic review and meta-analysis? A recent review compares all the three techniques i.e. ES vs ESBD vs EPBD. (Park CH et al. Comparative efficacy of various endoscopic techniques for the treatment of common bile duct stones: a network meta-analysis. *Gastrointest*



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

Endosc. 2017 Jul . pii: S0016-5107(17)32161-2. doi: 10.1016/j.gie.2017.07.038). The only difference is exclusion of two studies in abstract form in this recently published meta-analysis. 2. In the flow chart, the authors mention full text articles assessed for 34 articles. However, full text is not available for few of them (see below). Abstract 1. In the methods, the authors mention that “all relevant articles were accessed in full text”. However, two studies included in the meta-analysis do not appear to have full text and are probably available in abstract form only (Hong GY, Park SW, Seo KS, Moon H. Endoscopic sphincterotomy plus large- balloon dilation versus endoscopic sphincterotomy for removal of large common bile duct stones. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2009; 69: AB148 [DOI: 10.1016/ j.gie.2009.03.233] (Karsenti D, Coron E, Vanbiervliet G, Privat J, Kull E, Bichard P et al. Complete Sphincterotomy PLUS Large Balloon Dilatation of Sphincter of Oddi Versus Endoscopic Sphincterotomy for Large Bile Duct Stones Removal: A Large Prospective Multicenter Randomized Study. *Gastrointestinal Endoscopy*. May 2016 Volume 83, Issue 5, Supplement, Page AB133 DOI) Introduction 2. In the introduction segment, the authors mention “To the best of our knowledge, the present study involves only randomized clinical trials totaling 1230 patients comparing exclusively isolated sphincterotomy (ES) versus combined sphincterotomy and balloon dilation of papilla (ESBD).” Kindly avoid including such statements in the introduction segment, and include ‘what is known’ and what needs to be known’ in this segment. Methods and results 3. Methods and results have been aptly described Discussion 4. The discussion begins with conclusion regarding safety or adverse events. However, there is no mention on stone removal rate. Kindly include the same. 5. The second paragraph discusses regarding limitations of the study. Rather this should be mentioned towards the end of the discussion segment. In addition, if full texts were not available for some of the studies as mentioned above, kindly include that as limitation. 6. Kindly discuss the meta-analysis recently published and compare with the present one. Minor Comments The entire manuscript needs a great deal of language polishing.