



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

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

**Manuscript NO:** 53329

**Title:** A Bedside Score Predicting Retained Common Bile Duct Stone in Patients with Acute biliary Pancreatitis

**Reviewer’s code:** 02887546

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MAMS, MBBS, PhD

**Professional title:** Dean, Doctor, Professor

**Reviewer’s Country/Territory:** India

**Author’s Country/Territory:** Israel

**Manuscript submission date:** 2019-12-17

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-12-17 16:30

**Reviewer performed review:** 2019-12-23 09:16

**Review time:** 5 Days and 16 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer’s expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

## **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

COMMENTS The authors have done a retrospective study on biochemical values of patients with acute pancreatitis and identified that there is significant difference between those patients with CBD stones and those without. They have formulated a score to recognize beforehand whether the patient is having CBD obstruction, so that treatment schedule can be made more rigorous. However, it is not clear how it makes a difference. Authors have reported that they have done US an EUS in all patients. If US will identify CBD stones, what is the advantage of EUS? The scoring details should be given. The scientific explanation for the score for individual parameters needs to be given. The grammatical corrections noted may be incorporated.

## **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

### *Google Search:*

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

### *BPG Search:*

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

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

**Manuscript NO:** 53329

**Title:** A Bedside Score Predicting Retained Common Bile Duct Stone in Patients with Acute biliary Pancreatitis

**Reviewer's code:** 02482060

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Taiwan

**Author's Country/Territory:** Israel

**Manuscript submission date:** 2019-12-17

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-12-22 08:47

**Reviewer performed review:** 2019-12-25 15:11

**Review time:** 3 Days and 6 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://www.wjgnet.com**

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Comments: 1. Please elaborate your diagnostic criteria for acute pancreatitis. 2. How many patients fulfilled your diagnostic criteria for acute pancreatitis? How many of them were excluded for EUS and therefore not selected in this study? 3. Because EUS seems to be your reference standard for the presence or absence of CBD stones, why was this important procedure performed only by one endoscopist? This study will be more reliable if there were more than one reader to read the procedure images. 4. I presume there is a typo error in result section regarding “the third group, with a score of 41.12-51....”. Please check. 5. The authors may have to mention another limitation. That is their model is not validated in another cohort of patients. How do the authors deal with selection bias when doing internal validation using the same patient cohort?

#### **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

##### ***Google Search:***

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

##### ***BPG Search:***

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

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

**Manuscript NO:** 53329

**Title:** A Bedside Score Predicting Retained Common Bile Duct Stone in Patients with Acute biliary Pancreatitis

**Reviewer's code:** 03027643

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Japan

**Author's Country/Territory:** Israel

**Manuscript submission date:** 2019-12-17

**Reviewer chosen by:** Jie Wang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-12-23 23:40

**Reviewer performed review:** 2019-12-27 02:38

**Review time:** 3 Days and 2 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Dear Editor I have read the current manuscript with interest. I think that the manuscript is suitable for publication in the World Journal of Gastroenterology with minor revision. With best regards Kinya Fujita

#### **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

##### ***Google Search:***

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

##### ***BPG Search:***

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

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

**Manuscript NO:** 53329

**Title:** A Bedside Score Predicting Retained Common Bile Duct Stone in Patients with Acute biliary Pancreatitis

**Reviewer’s code:** 03015908

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

**Reviewer’s Country/Territory:** China

**Author’s Country/Territory:** Israel

**Manuscript submission date:** 2019-12-17

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-12-17 21:31

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-01-01 08:46

**Review time:** 14 Days and 11 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer’s expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Tawfik Khoury and colleagues aimed to generate a simple non-invasive score to predict the presence of CBD stone in patients with biliary pancreatitis. They developed and recommend a diagnostic score that included three significant parameters on multivariate analysis to predict retained common bile duct stone. The study is of interest to address a clinical issue and the recommended diagnostic scoring system might be used as an important aid for practitioners to guide them towards a more prudent decision regarding therapeutic plans for their patients if this system is accurate. There are still major concerns regarding the methods used and interpretation of the data. Major 1. In multivariate analysis, three parameters were identified to predict CBD stone; age, GGT level and dilated CBD, with a very high area under the curve. How about the area under the curve for every one of these three parameter? If the area under the curve of one of three parameters is higher than 0.8433, it is unnecessary to combine all three parameters to predict the presence of CBD stone in patients with biliary pancreatitis. 2. Since OR '1' actually implies a lack of statistical significance, why did age (OR 1.062) and GGT level (OR 1.003) whose OR so close to '1' contribute greatly to the diagnostic scoring model? Specific Language editing is required throughout the manuscript. The following is a short list of typo but is not limited by the list: 1. In the sentence ' In these guidelines, clinical gallstone pancreatitis by itself received moderate strength in predicting common bile duct [14]', ' common bile duct ' is better to be changed into ' CBD '. ( Page 5) 2. The sentence ' Univariate and multivariate logistic regression was used to estimate odds ratios (OR) of baseline factors, backward selection was used to select the final model.' is better to be changed into ' Univariate and multivariate logistic regression was used to estimate odds ratios (OR) of baseline factors, and backward selection was used to select the final model.'. ( Page 7) 3. The sentence ' Finally, we determined the diagnostic

accuracy of the cut-off points generated using this formula by calculating sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value and negative predictive value.' should be ' Finally, we determined the diagnostic accuracy of the cut-off points generated using this formula by calculating sensitivity, specificity, PPV and negative predictive value (NPV). ' . ( Page 7) 4. The sentence ' The mean age in groups A and B were  $54.8 \pm 18.8$  and  $68.9 \pm 14.3$ , respectively. 'should be ' The mean age in groups A and B were  $54.8 \pm 18.8$  and  $68.9 \pm 14.3$  years, respectively.' ( Page 7) 5. The sentence ' In multivariate regression analysis, three parameters were identified to significantly predict CBD stones: age (OR 1.062, 95% CI 1.026-1.097,  $P=0.0005$ ), GGT level (OR 1.003, 95%CI 1.001-1.004,  $P=0.0003$ ) and dilated CBD (OR 3.685, 95% CI 1.160-11.711,  $P=0.027$ ), with receiver operator characteristics (ROC) of 0.8433 (figure 1).'should be ' In multivariate regression analysis, three parameters were identified to significantly predict CBD stones: age (OR 1.062, 95% CI 1.026-1.097,  $P=0.0005$ ), GGT level (OR 1.003, 95%CI 1.001-1.004,  $P=0.0003$ ) and dilated CBD (OR 3.685, 95% CI 1.160-11.711,  $P=0.027$ ), with area under the curve of 0.8433 determined by a ROC curve (figure 1). '? ( Page 8) 6. The sentence ' Also, in three different studies evaluating the performance of different noninvasive tests in the prediction of CBD stones, GGT was the most powerful predictor [31] [32]. 'should be ' Also, in two different studies evaluating the performance of different noninvasive tests in the prediction of CBD stones, GGT was the most powerful predictor [31] [32]. ' . ( Page 11) 7. ' Total bilirubin mg%' should be ' Total bilirubin mg/dL '.(Table 1) 8. ' Dilated CBD per US ' should be ' Dilated CBD by US '; ' GGT (U\L) ' should be ' GGT (U/L) '.(Table 3) 9. ' (Age (years)  $\times$  0.5 + GGT (U\L)  $\times$  0.02  $\times$  CBD width by US (mm)  $\times$  10) ' should be ' (Age (years)  $\times$  0.5 + GGT (U\L)  $\times$  0.02 + CBD width by US (mm)  $\times$  10) (Table 4)

## INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

### *Google Search:*



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](https://www.wjgnet.com)

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

***BPG Search:***

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No



**RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT**

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

**Manuscript NO:** 53329

**Title:** A Bedside Score Predicting Retained Common Bile Duct Stone in Patients with Acute biliary Pancreatitis

**Reviewer's code:** 03015908

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** China

**Author's Country/Territory:** Israel

**Manuscript submission date:** 2019-12-17

**Reviewer chosen by:** Jie Wang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-03-07 21:59

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-03-08 00:28

**Review time:** 2 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

I think the revised manuscript can be accepted by this journal without further revision.

#### **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

##### ***Google Search:***

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

##### ***BPG Search:***

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No



**RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT**

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

**Manuscript NO:** 53329

**Title:** A Bedside Score Predicting Retained Common Bile Duct Stone in Patients with Acute biliary Pancreatitis

**Reviewer’s code:** 03027643

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer’s Country/Territory:** Japan

**Author’s Country/Territory:** Israel

**Manuscript submission date:** 2019-12-17

**Reviewer chosen by:** Jie Wang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-03-06 04:45

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-03-08 11:38

**Review time:** 2 Days and 6 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer’s expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Only one point should be revised for publication. The words “negative predictive value (NPV)” should be “NPV” in the paragraph “Model building of diagnostic score”, because the words “negative predictive value (NPV) ” in the previous paragraph “Statistical analysis”.

#### **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

##### ***Google Search:***

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

##### ***BPG Search:***

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No