



Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited

Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,
315-321 Lockhart Road,
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 5139

Title: Endoscopic sphincterotomy plus large-balloon dilation versus endoscopic sphincterotomy alone for removal of bile duct stones: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials

Reviewer code: 02453015

Science editor: Qi, Yuan

Date sent for review: 2013-08-18 20:06

Date reviewed: 2013-08-19 00:28

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 checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		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

This is an interesting and well performed meta-analysis addressing the efficacy of endoscopic sphincterotomy plus large-balloon dilation versus endoscopic sphincterotomy alone for removal of bile duct stones. Major concerns: 1. Is there any study excluded in languages other English. If so, the authors need to include these. 2. For eligible RCTs, besides Jadad score, the "Cochrane Collaboration's tool for assessing risk of bias" is highly recommended (please cite and follow Table 2 of the attached paper 1). Lamivudine in late pregnancy to interrupt in utero transmission of hepatitis B virus: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Shi Z, Yang Y, Ma L, Li X, Schreiber A. *Obstet Gynecol.* 2010 Jul;116(1):147-59. 3. Funnel plots, which show publication bias, should be added (please cite and follow Figure 2B of the attached paper 2). Breastfeeding of newborns by mothers carrying hepatitis B virus: a meta-analysis and systematic review. Shi Z, Yang Y, Wang H, Ma L, Schreiber A, Li X, Sun W, Zhao X, Yang X, Zhang L, Lu W, Teng J, An Y. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med.* 2011 Sep;165(9):837-46. 4. Flow chart in Figure 1, please update with the (please cite and follow Figure 1 of the attached paper 2). 5. Some items already shown in forest plots are not necessary to be shown in Table 3. 6. The heterogeneity of Figure 4 is too high, and needs to be discussed with clinical relevance.



Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited

Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,
315-321 Lockhart Road,
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 5139

Title: Endoscopic sphincterotomy plus large-balloon dilation versus endoscopic sphincterotomy alone for removal of bile duct stones: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials

Reviewer code: 00036837

Science editor: Qi, Yuan

Date sent for review: 2013-08-18 20:06

Date reviewed: 2013-08-20 01:29

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" 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)		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

GENERAL COMMENTS Overall, my review on this manuscript is favourable. I have just a single concern in that I would like to be reassured that this meta-analysis differs to a meaningful extent from that published by Liu et al. (2013; see ref.10). From this point of view, the comments made by the authors in the Discussion are quite adequate (lines 219 to 235 in the Discussion). Furthermore, I have numerous specific points that are presented below.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

1. As regards language, some terms could perhaps be replaced by more appropriate terms. For example: "authenticated" (line 71), "limited" (line 240), "certify" (line 248). 2. Please provide a reference for the "well-arranged trial" mentioned in line 72; it is not clear if the "well-arranged trial" and the "conflicting results" (i.e. ref.13) refer to the same study. 3. There are too many abbreviations. Some of these are useless (UEGW and DDW in lines 83-84); in my view, other terms could be more directly understandable by avoiding the abbreviation (e.g. ML). 4. Line 191: "Use" should be lowercase. 5. The syntax of the sentence "One RCT included inin our review" (lines 221-223) should be improved. 6. The journal abbreviation in line 278 is wrong.