



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, United States

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242 Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 9370

Title: Comparative analysis of ERCP, IDUS, EUS and CT in predicting malignant bile duct strictures – results of a tertiary referral center with 234 patients

Reviewer code: 00503175

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2014-02-11 09:41

Date reviewed: 2014-02-15 07:21

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

Article "Comparative analysis of ERCP, IDUS, EUS and CT in predicting malignant bile duct strictures – results of a tertiary referral center with 234 patients" by Heinzow et al. is according to my opinion, acceptable for publication with minor revisions. The authors analyzed influence of different diagnostic techniques in predicting malignant bile duct strictures. The results of this study are useful for management of patients with bile duct stricture. Major revisions: NONE

Minor revisions : 1. In Material and Methods section (Procedures) I believe that this two sentences are divide by mistake: 194 procedures included additional forceps biopsies. Endoscopic transpapillary biopsies (n= 4-8 specimens) were taken out of the biliary strictures by straight or angled endoscopic forceps. 2. In section Discussion, page 14 entitiy instead of entity.



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, United States

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242 Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 9370

Title: Comparative analysis of ERCP, IDUS, EUS and CT in predicting malignant bile duct strictures – results of a tertiary referral center with 234 patients

Reviewer code: 00289448

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2014-02-11 09:41

Date reviewed: 2014-02-15 14:38

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors present an interesting research. The paper is well written but needs some revisions before publishing. 1- define the imaging criteria used in each modality to diagnose benign vs. malignant bile strictures. 2- MRI and MRCP are not mentioned at all though they are important imaging techniques in the workup of biliary tree pathology with better diagnostic performances than CT. Why MR techniques were not used in the patients of this study? 3- You should add another image panel of a case showing a malignant stricture diagnosed with ERCP/IDUS that was missed or misdiagnosed by EUS and CT. This is important to demonstrate the superiority of ERCP/IDUS over those techniques.



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, United States

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242 Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 9370

Title: Comparative analysis of ERCP, IDUS, EUS and CT in predicting malignant bile duct strictures – results of a tertiary referral center with 234 patients

Reviewer code: 00289451

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2014-02-11 09:41

Date reviewed: 2014-02-20 07:10

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The paper is well written, nevertheless some minor revisions are still needed. First of all, more details about criteria for the clinical assessment should be provided for the studied imaging techniques possibly providing some insight on future quantification methodology. Then, the results should be presented in a more accessible way: instead of only tables and numbers some graphics summarizing the results would facilitate the reader in evaluating the presented approaches. Finally, some comparative considerations about invasiveness, operative difficulties, costs and exam durations should be also better detailed for a better full framework depiction of the presented conclusions.