

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 16455

Title: A randomized study of 0.025-inch vs 0.035-inch guide wires with wire-guided cannulation

Reviewer's code: 00033705

Reviewer's country: Germany

Science editor: Jing Yu

Date sent for review: 2015-01-19 10:41

Date reviewed: 2015-01-22 00:54

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a most interesting study on the use of guidewires in ERCP. Randomized studies in endoscopy are scarce and the subject of this study is particularly of interest for the reader of WJG. There are two crucial points that prevent publication of the manuscript in the present form: (1) major statistical limitations, (2) major limitations of language. Major points: Ad (1) there is no mentioning about calculation of the case number in the statistical part (sample size calculation). It is absolutely required to delineate the rational for including this specific number of patients. Therefore, the primary end point has to be clearly denominated and to be differentiated from secondary end points. Please give statistical significance (p) for success rates, PEP etc. in the text. Better to give IQR or CI for duration of cannulation. Ad (2) limitations of language should be corrected by a native speaker. Minor points How was randomization performed in detail? 269 patients with a na?ve papilla in a case volume short of 400 seems hardly believable, please explain. ?The aim of this study was to compare this issue" - Please specify the aim of the study "Jagwire Plus" - is this really the correct naming of the product used? Please describe features of the guidewire used in detail (what is the difference between



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>

the two diameters of the guidewire, is the tip of the wire really different??) Many centers have abandoned to measure post-ERCP amylase because of lack of clinical consequence. Please explain your procedure. What is the clinical consequence of this study for your daily practice; please explain in depth in the discussion.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 16455

Title: A randomized study of 0.025-inch vs 0.035-inch guide wires with wire-guided cannulation

Reviewer's code: 02823707

Reviewer's country: Finland

Science editor: Jing Yu

Date sent for review: 2015-01-19 10:41

Date reviewed: 2015-01-22 17:50

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Fairly well written paper on cannulation using regular and thin guide wire in random fashion. The result is expected slightly, although not statistically, favouring the regular wire. The table 2 of endoscopic procedures is distracting and should be omitted. One sentence in the text is sufficient mentioning the fact.