

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

ESPS manuscript NO: 12876

Title: The value of temporary stents for the management of perivaterian perforation during ERCP

Reviewer code: 00051746

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2014-07-28 21:21

Date reviewed: 2014-07-29 13:50

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Authors described about the management of perivaterian perforation during ERCP in this review. I think that this review is very interesting for endoscopists and gastroenterologists and worth publishing.

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

ESPS manuscript NO: 12876

Title: The value of temporary stents for the management of perivaterian perforation during ERCP

Reviewer code: 00058053

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2014-07-28 21:21

Date reviewed: 2014-08-02 15:03

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existing	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

congratulations for well designed review on important topic. post-ERCP perforation and the use of covered SEMS. I have few comments. 1- the method for early detection of perforation is deficient. please more clarification. 2- some abbreviations are not explained eg. ERBD ... Please explain.