

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 87506

Title: Acute cholangitis: Does malignant biliary obstruction vs choledocholithiasis etiology change the clinical presentation and outcomes?

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06079177

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: Taiwan

Manuscript submission date: 2023-08-13

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-08-15 08:54

Reviewer performed review: 2023-08-15 09:44

Review time: 1 Hour

| | |
|---------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Scientific quality | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input 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 Grade E: Do not publish |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

Dear Editor and Authors, I read the manuscript from Yung-Kuan et al with real interest. The paper is well written and clear, so I congratulate with the Authors. Although AC is quite uncommon in patients with MBO and native papilla/not previously drained, the results and therefore the conclusions of the manuscript are very interesting. The only very minor correction I would apply is to replace the term "Klatskin tumor" with the actual and more correct "Perihilar cholangiocarcinoma" terminology. Also, I would improve and strengthen the title, for ex. "Acute cholangitis: does a malignant biliary obstruction vs. choledocholithiasis etiology change the clinical presentation and outcomes?" or something similar, because the actual title doesn't really reflect the core findings of the study.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 87506

Title: Acute cholangitis: Does malignant biliary obstruction vs choledocholithiasis etiology change the clinical presentation and outcomes?

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 00503249

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Academic Editor, Director, Full Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: Taiwan

Manuscript submission date: 2023-08-13

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-08-15 14:53

Reviewer performed review: 2023-08-19 14:51

Review time: 3 Days and 23 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 |
| 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 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 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 paper by Tsou et al. titled “Acute cholangitis: the differences between the etiology of malignant biliary obstruction and common bile duct stones” showed that early recognition and early acceptance of ERCP are critical for malignant biliary obstruction (MBO) patients with acute cholangitis (AC). Despite the retrospective fashion of the study, results look interesting in that they come from a large study population, on which statistical analysis was elegantly performed, providing the reader with a clear message.

Specific Comments 1. Sclerosing Cholangitis (SC), a primary autoimmune disease of biliary tree, may at first hand mimic the radiological pattern of MBO (Isaia I. et al., Am J Med Sci, 2022). In the work-up of SC, European Society of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy (ESGE) and European Association for the Study of the Liver (EASL) Clinical Guidelines suggested that Endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography (ERCP) is not the method of choice (Aabakken I. et al., Endoscopy 2017) for diagnosis. Since SC, during its relapse episodes, may share many characteristics of common cholangitis, did Authors screen their patients for serum IG-4, in order to consider an alternative diagnosis?