

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 17841

Title: Innovative technique of needlescopic grasper-assisted single-incision laparoscopic common bile duct exploration: A comparative study

Reviewer's code: 03035769

Reviewer's country: France

Science editor: Jing Yu

Date sent for review: 2015-03-30 19:04

Date reviewed: 2015-04-12 02:01

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This study is limited by its retrospective analysis and small numbers

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 17841

Title: Innovative technique of needlescopic grasper-assisted single-incision laparoscopic common bile duct exploration: A comparative study

Reviewer's code: 03031415

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Jing Yu

Date sent for review: 2015-03-30 19:04

Date reviewed: 2015-05-01 09:14

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 type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

You should have revision as below: 1. (abstract, L16) There is no unit of the amount of the analgesic. 2. (P6, L2) You must mention how to detect stone using a rigid nephroscope. 3. (P6, L5) This is the first important point in this article. Can you get visualization of the lower part of the CBD using choledochoscope through the umbilical port in all cases? How can you have it? 4. (P6, L12) What is the Lap-suture?? You had better explain how to repair CBD using Lap-suture?. 5. (P6, L19) From where and how do you insert a drain in nSIL-CBDE? 6. (P6) You should briefly mention the method of conventional laparoscopic CBDE. 7. (P8, L15) You should letter the unit of the analgesic. 8. (P8, L22) This is the second important point. I think that nSIL-CBD reduced intravenous analgesic administration and the length of hospital, because the drain were less frequently placed in its patients. You should explain about it. 9. (P9, L14) It is not "SPLS", is it "SILS"? 10. (P11, L9) You have two conclusions. You should write only one conclusion. 11. (P11, L10) What is the CAS abbreviated? 12. (Table 1) There are no head of the table.