

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 69246

Title: Comparison of the impact of endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography between pre-COVID-19 and current COVID-19 outbreaks in South Korea—retrospective

survey

Reviewer's code: 05935566 Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MBBS, MS

Professional title: Assistant Professor, Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: South Korea

Manuscript submission date: 2021-06-22

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-06-23 08:00

Reviewer performed review: 2021-06-23 08:05

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous



https://www.wjgnet.com

statements

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear authors, Its a well written article, however, mild language modifications are needed. Regards



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 69246

Title: Comparison of the impact of endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography between pre-COVID-19 and current COVID-19 outbreaks in South Korea—retrospective survey

Reviewer's code: 05702948 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Colombia

Author's Country/Territory: South Korea

Manuscript submission date: 2021-06-22

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-06-22 15:29

Reviewer performed review: 2021-06-25 11:13

Review time: 2 Days and 19 Hours

Scientific quality	[Y] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[Y] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous



statements

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Excellent study. Good methodology and writing. I have no comments on the need to correct anything



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 69246

Title: Comparison of the impact of endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography between pre-COVID-19 and current COVID-19 outbreaks in South Korea—retrospective

survey

Reviewer's code: 05426937 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: South Korea

Manuscript submission date: 2021-06-22

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-06-22 16:09

Reviewer performed review: 2021-06-30 15:32

Review time: 7 Days and 23 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous



https://www.wjgnet.com

statements

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

No comments.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 69246

Title: Comparison of the impact of endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography between pre-COVID-19 and current COVID-19 outbreaks in South Korea – retrospective

survey

Reviewer's code: 03491298 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: South Korea

Manuscript submission date: 2021-06-22

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-06-22 21:57

Reviewer performed review: 2021-07-04 03:02

Review time: 11 Days and 5 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[]Yes [Y]No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com **https**://www.wjgnet.com

statements

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1 Title. Is this article a retrospective study? Or a survey? I would like you to change the title name e.g. A comparison of the impact of ERCP between pre-COVID-19 and current COVID-19 outbreaks in South Korea- retrospective survey. 2 Abstract reflects the work described in the manuscript? 3 Key words are OK. 4 Background. This manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study. 5 Methods. In "COVID-19 quarantine and protective equipment", you described the detail of PPE and procedures under COVID-19 pandemic, however, we didn't know about the PPE before pandemic. You surveyed the pre-pandemic and under pandemic situations of ERCP, you should describe the differences of PPE, the flowchart before ERCP in the 6 Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the era of pre-pamdemic. experiments used in this study? What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field? 7 Discussion. You should consider in detail why the number of ERCP cases was low in 2018 and why the number of cases increased in 2019. Also, as you know, a reduction in emergency ERCP can be a critical event, and the consequences can be fatal. Shouldn't the emergency ERCP be reduced while maintaining PPE and barrier procedures against aerosols? (Regular ERCP can be reduced) Illustrations and tables. In figure 1, you should connect them with a dot line so that you can easily see the transition of the number of cases. 9 Biostatistics. OK 10 Units. OK 11 References. Excellent. 12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. This manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented. Language and grammar was appropriate. 13 Research methods and reporting. OK 14 Ethics statements. OK