

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 8906

Title: A pilot proof-of-concept study of a modified device for one-step EUS-guided biliary drainage in a new experimental biliary dilatation animal model.

Reviewer code: 00074961

Science editor: Wen, Ling-Ling

Date sent for review: 2014-01-11 18:03

Date reviewed: 2014-01-13 06:52

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" 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 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	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The assessment of an available bile duct dilatation model is not the main issue of your study; perhaps you should reduce the explanation about it in the discussion (last paragraph of page 11). In any case, it is an interesting secondary point

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 8906

Title: A pilot proof-of-concept study of a modified device for one-step EUS-guided biliary drainage in a new experimental biliary dilatation animal model.

Reviewer code: 02572102

Science editor: Wen, Ling-Ling

Date sent for review: 2014-01-11 18:03

Date reviewed: 2014-01-15 10:27

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 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

The article is interesting but the procedure details of the stent insertion could be more clear. A figure (illustration) of the procedure and anatomic location of the stent would enhance this manuscript. The fluoroscopic images and the endoscopic photograph does not provide sufficient clarity.