

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 7096

Title: MRCP Findings of Pancreaticobiliary Maljunction and Pancreaticobiliary Diseases

Reviewer code: 00004525

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2013-11-04 09:55

Date reviewed: 2013-11-06 05:53

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)	<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

Clinical practice guidelines for pancreaticobiliary maljunction (PBM) have been published (J Gastroenterol 2012). Please see the guidelines. Study design in this paper is incorrect. *To diagnose PBM by MRCP, common channel at least > 15mm is necessary. *PBM is rare. *PBM is associated in almost all cases of congenital biliary dilatation.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 7096

Title: MRCP Findings of Pancreaticobiliary Maljunction and Pancreaticobiliary Diseases

Reviewer code: 01212463

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2013-11-04 09:55

Date reviewed: 2013-11-10 12:16

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input 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 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)	<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

Clinically relevant article that will be of interest to the readership.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 7096

Title: MRCP Findings of Pancreaticobiliary Maljunction and Pancreaticobiliary Diseases

Reviewer code: 00503773

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2013-11-04 09:55

Date reviewed: 2013-11-12 00:59

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

I read the manuscript named "MRCP Findings of Pancreaticobiliary Maljunction and Pancreaticobiliary Diseases " (ESPS Manuscript NO: 7096) and my recommendations are as follows; The relation between pancreatobiliary maljunction and pancreatobiliary disorders is well known issue. Authors have handled and discussed this topic extensively in the manuscript. This manuscript is well written and documented. I think that this manuscript is suitable and worth to be published in World Journal of Gastroenterology.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 7096

Title: MRCP Findings of Pancreaticobiliary Maljunction and Pancreaticobiliary Diseases

Reviewer code: 02445056

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2013-11-04 09:55

Date reviewed: 2013-11-24 00:05

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 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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This paper is focused on a very interesting topic. The number of patients is absolutely enough for the analysis. Anyway there are some point should be better assessed before publication. 1) The authors should explain in the methods the inclusion criteria used. Of course that can change the value of the results. 2) The paper is not based on MRCP performed in healthy population followed for many years after the MRI, so the conclusions regarding the risk to develop pancreaticobiliary diseases are not correct. If the authors want to define the risk associated with pancreatobiliary maljunction, they should have data from healthy population and follow during the time which type of maljunction is associated more to the risk. 3) The conclusion should underline better the limits of the study, done (if I understood well) in a symptomatic group of patients and without any follow-up. 4) The English should be improved.