

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 54946

Title: Endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography in elderly patients: Difficult cannulation and adverse events

Reviewer's code: 03479389

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Director

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-03-06

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-03-06 10:38

Reviewer performed review: 2020-03-06 11:11

Review time: 1 Hour

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 Grade E: Do not publish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 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



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This article is significant as a prospective study; however, this is not a new topic. You should investigate 90 years or older. Further, please indicate the statistically required sample size.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 54946

Title: Endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography in elderly patients: Difficult cannulation and adverse events

Reviewer's code: 03727100

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor, Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-03-06

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-03-13 06:32

Reviewer performed review: 2020-03-14 13:48

Review time: 1 Day and 7 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 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
Conclusion	<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
Re-review	<input 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

This paper is the prospective study to clarify the characteristics of ERCP in the elderly. However, there are several points that should be revised. 1. Several abbreviations should be spelled out in the main text (ERCP, PEP, CCI,...). 2. How did authors determine the sample size of this study? 3. What is the anatomy of the papilla? Authors should explain it. 4. The name of group is difficult to understand. Would you please change the name of group (for example, Younger group, or Older group)? 5. Figure 1 is difficult to understand. Patients who were difficult to cannulate should be set below the "Based on age". 6. The "RESULTS" section is wordy. The authors should describe compactly. 7. Is the Table 3 necessary? This is the comparison between three groups. The authors should perform sub effect tests. 7. What is the definitions of Charlson score, Second ERCP, papillary morphology, CCI? The authors should explain the examination items in the "METHOD" part. 8. There were few patients who got PEP to perform the multivariate analysis. 9. The DISCUSSION section is lengthy. You should describe about the items that was statistically different between two groups.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 54946

Title: Endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography in elderly patients: Difficult cannulation and adverse events

Reviewer's code: 05099041

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Medical Assistant

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Brazil

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-03-06

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-03-09 18:47

Reviewer performed review: 2020-03-17 19:22

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
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 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



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The research team performed a prospective study regarding adverse events of ERCP on super aged patients. It was a well conducted prospective study, although information regarding sample size calculation are missing. A few notes to help improve the overall quality of the study are attached.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 54946

Title: Endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography in elderly patients: Difficult cannulation and adverse events

Reviewer's code: 01714826

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: FACG, FACP, FASGE, MD

Professional title: Emeritus Professor, Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-03-06

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-03-14 04:47

Reviewer performed review: 2020-03-19 10:07

Review time: 5 Days and 5 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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input 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

This paper addresses cannulation difficulty and complications of ERCP in patients over 80 yrs of age. 1. The methodology is neither clear nor uniform. Specific questions with regard to cannulation are as follows a. What was the technique used initially ? Is it sphincterotome with guidewire or cannula with guidewire. b. If the initial attempts fail does the endoscopist go to needle knife or pancreatic sphincterotomy, in any particular order uniformly in every patient or does the endoscopist pick and choose the technique based on his expertise. 2. Almost 1/3rd of the patient underwent ERCP had difficult cannulation. This seems to be much higher than the published data. 3. The number of patients in the difficult cannulation group over 80 yrs of age is very small compared to those who are under 80 yrs of age. Can this affect the statistics ? 4. The total number in table 2 and the numbers shown for group A and group B do not add up to be equal. Minor points : 1. Change the title to ERCP in elderly patients; difficult cannulation and adverse events. 2. Page 3 para 2 : Delete the first two sentences and start with although multiple studies..... 3. Page 4 para 3 : Sentence 7 - change 'applied' to 'deployed'