

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 21725

Title: EUS-guided biliary drainage: Who, when, which, and how ?

Reviewer's code: 00039417

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2015-08-11 13:48

Date reviewed: 2015-08-15 18:34

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an excellent review paper on various EUS-guided biliary drainage methods and is well written on how to select the suitable method for individual case. [Minor points] The reviewer felt the following a few points should be clarified or revised. Page 9, line 14-16. The author underlined the sentence on the citation of Gupta et al. Is this meaning something particular? On Table 1, the algorithm of the normal anatomy is including "EUS-HES". Is this the mistyping of "EUS-HGS"?

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 21725

Title: EUS-guided biliary drainage: Who, when, which, and how ?

Reviewer's code: 00227403

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2015-08-11 13:48

Date reviewed: 2015-08-20 19:56

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input 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 the section abstract it should be better to report the sentence not as "we should select...." but as "....should be selected" -page 9 the sentence "Gupta et al. reported similar success rates (84.3% vs. 90.4%; P=0.15) and similar complications rates (32.6% vs. 35.6%; P=0.64) for extrahepatic and intrahepatic approaches, respectively[23]" is highlighted; is there a reason? page 10, the sentence "After EUS-CDS using the oblique view, double penetration of the duodenum was seen in 4% (4/101) of our prospective follow-up patients" is there a reference?

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 21725

Title: EUS-guided biliary drainage: Who, when, which, and how ?

Reviewer's code: 00160226

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2015-08-11 13:48

Date reviewed: 2015-08-25 15:55

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 checked="" 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 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"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors performed a review on EUS guided biliary drainage. Overall it is a well written paper. I only have a few minor queries. 1) In the section, who should performed EUS-BD. The authors mentioned that EUS BD should not be used to compensate a lack of ERCP skills. However, at the end section, the authors mentioned that EUSBD may replace ERCP as the 1st choice for drainage. This is a little bit contradictory. Although EUS BD has the potential to be superior to ERCP in terms of stent patency, it is also associated with increased expertise, risks and cost. I believe that such statement may be a little bit early to state for the time being. Perhaps we need to tone it down a little in the paper. 2) In general, the use of unpublished data is not encouraged. As it has not underwent the usual peer review progress and some people may doubt its accuracy. So when the authors quote their own experience, it may better to quote published data only. 3) Pls add a section on potential complications of EUS-BD and then discuss unique complications. 4) Also the authors included figures on focal cholangitis and abscess but there were no discussion on the paper. Pls add the discussion and suggest methods to avoid these complications.