

# ESPS Peer-review Report

**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 10729

**Title:** Clinical usefulness and current problems of pancreatic duct stenting for preventing post-ERCP pancreatitis.

**Reviewer code:** 00004525

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2014-04-17 08:15

**Date reviewed:** 2014-04-18 05:33

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existed	<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

If this is a review article, methods of review papers with including and excluding criteria should be described. There are no new findings.

# ESPS Peer-review Report

**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 10729

**Title:** Clinical usefulness and current problems of pancreatic duct stenting for preventing post-ERCP pancreatitis.

**Reviewer code:** 00070291

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2014-04-17 08:15

**Date reviewed:** 2014-04-19 21:07

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	language polishing	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

It is an interesting paper for the pancreatic stent and well writing. There are some advise for the author: 1) There is room for the extensive language polishing; 2) Is there any reports about the stent in pancreatic duct that slide to the tail of pancreas, which we meet in the clinical practice.

# ESPS Peer-review Report

**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 10729

**Title:** Clinical usefulness and current problems of pancreatic duct stenting for preventing post-ERCP pancreatitis.

**Reviewer code:** 00028941

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2014-04-17 08:15

**Date reviewed:** 2014-04-30 09:43

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	language polishing	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Sakai et al. reported clinical usefulness and current problems of pancreatic stenting of PEP. They described the mechanism and risk factor of PEP, usefulness and kinds of pancreatic stent precisely. This review is useful for reader's understanding of pancreatic stenting of PEP. In order to strengthen this review, comparison between pancreatic stenting and other methods that prevent PEP is needed.