

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 10867

Title: Small sphincterotomy combined with endoscopic papillary large balloon dilation versus sphincterotomy alone for removal of bile duct stones

Reviewer code: 02860705

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2014-04-24 20:36

Date reviewed: 2014-04-26 22:05

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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<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"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

the manuscript is well written

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 10867

Title: Small sphincterotomy combined with endoscopic papillary large balloon dilation versus sphincterotomy alone for removal of bile duct stones

Reviewer code: 02860712

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2014-04-24 20:36

Date reviewed: 2014-04-28 05:17

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"/> Existing	<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 checked="" 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"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Manuscript 10867 April 27th 2014 Comments to the Authors This is an interesting paper which addresses an issue of clinical relevance. I think, however, that the following major changes should be made: 1. I understand that this is a retrospective study. However, the Authors should better describe which criteria they followed assigning patients to EST or EST+EPLBD. In particular, it is of interest to understand whether EST alone was used in the first years, and EST+EPLBD in the latter period of this study; it is also of interest to understand whether EST alone was preferred for the largest stones (what is the median diameter of the stones?) ; and whether, in difficult cases, "regulated" EST+EPLBD was converted to extended EST. 2. Do the Authors advise, on the basis of their results, that EST+EPLBD and EST should be compared in a controlled trial? 3. The text contains a huge number of errors and needs major language polishing

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 10867

Title: Small sphincterotomy combined with endoscopic papillary large balloon dilation versus sphincterotomy alone for removal of bile duct stones

Reviewer code: 02860590

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2014-04-24 20:36

Date reviewed: 2014-05-12 05:28

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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" 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		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Article - Small sphincterotomy combined with papillary large balloon dilatation versus sphincterotomy alone for removal of bile duct stones This study evaluated the efficacy and safety of EST+EPLBD and EST alone for removal of large bile duct stones. My specific queries and comments are below: Abstract: The characteristics of the two groups are not well described. The abstract does not state how the patients were selected for sphincterotomy (EST) or sphincterotomy combined with papillary large balloon much (EST + EPLBD). The results show that the rate of bleeding and recurrence of CBD stone were significantly lower in the group A than that of in the group B. However, the abstract doesn't state if those effects were independent of the characteristics of the patients such as age, sex, severity of baseline disease and presence of other comorbidities. Furthermore, the text should be reviewed due to grammatical error. 2. Pg 3, Introduction. The authors present a very positive view of EST + EPLBD. There are certainly some studies that suggest of EST + EPLBD can be helpful. However, I believe there are other studies that do not show the same results. To be balanced, it would be helpful to show both sides. 3. Pg 4, Design: Can you clarify how were the patients selected for sphincterotomy (EST) or sphincterotomy combined with papillary large balloon much (EST + EPLBD)? 7. Pg 6, statistics: Were the data distributed normally? If not, then perhaps medians would be better than means. 8. Pg 6, Results: The information that is presented in tables does not need to be repeated in the text. 9. Pg 7-10: The authors have to describe the study's



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

limitations in details. Moreover grammatical errors/constructions should be evaluated along the whole article. ? Accept but needs revision (major and minor).