

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 81997

Title: Comprehensive review on small common bile duct stones

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03845526

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Chief Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Japan

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-01

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-12-05 12:46

Reviewer performed review: 2022-12-09 13:14

Review time: 4 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This review analyze the pros and cons of EPBD and EST for CBD small stones retrieval comprehensively, combined guidelines with updated literatures. Here are some questions about this article. 1. The author defined small stones as less than 10mm in diameter. I recommend to stratify the small stones with two subgroups, less than 5mm and 5-10mm, and analyze respectively Since ESBD or EPBD is not always in need in patients with stones less than 5mm. But on the flip side, EPBD or ESBD will be conducted routinely in 5-10mm stones. 2. Some literatures compared the pressure of short term and long term SO between EPBD and EST, which was associated with the recurrence of CBD stones. So relevant contents are suggested to complement. 3. There was three techniques for small stones less than 10mm, including EST, EPBD, ESBD. The indication for these techniques are supposed to clarified and specified. 4. Distal biliary stricture accompanied by proximal bile duct dilation is a specific situation. How to retrieve stones and what should be selected, EST or EPBD, or ESBD, should be discussed. 5. In one sentence, ESBD was typed as ESBE by mistake. Please correct it.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 81997

Title: Comprehensive review on small common bile duct stones

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06468659

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Japan

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-01

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-01-06 04:05

Reviewer performed review: 2023-01-07 13:35

Review time: 1 Day and 9 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input 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

This study by Sakue Masuda(MD, MS) and colleagues is very meaningful and useful. The authors have reviewed the treatment progress of small common bile duct stones, especially about EPBD and EST. However, I may ask a few questions about this manuscript. 1. As the title "A comprehensive review on small common bile duct stones" said, would you please demonstrate some research outcomes of laparoscopic/choledochoscopic treatment on small common bile duct stones. 2.If possible, Would you please add a new table about the incidence and treatments of short-term and long-term complications of EPBD/EST; 3. In "Abstract", line 3, change the word "Indications" to "indications". 4.At page 12, line 8, please change the abbreviation "ESBE" to "ESBD".