

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 27916

Title: Influence of night duty on endoscopic therapy for bile duct stones

Reviewer's code: 03364364

Reviewer's country: India

Science editor: Jing Yu

Date sent for review: 2016-06-23 09:58

Date reviewed: 2016-08-02 19:33

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" 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"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input 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		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript present an interesting study and can be accepted with minor language corrections.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 27916

Title: Influence of night duty on endoscopic therapy for bile duct stones

Reviewer's code: 03012867

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Jing Yu

Date sent for review: 2016-06-23 09:58

Date reviewed: 2016-08-22 22:52

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"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" 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 innovative, the conclusion is instructive and practical for endoscopic management for bile duct stones. Personally, I have several doubts or revision opinions that I'd like to share with you: 1, In the discussion sections, you think 'The higher rate of EPLBD may have been due to the tendency for a higher number of stones in patients treated by endoscopists after night duty'. Technically, EPLBD can be applied for removal of large or difficult common bile duct stones, as you mentioned, 'EPLBD was performed if the transverse diameter of the largest stone was >12 mm or many bile duct stones were difficult to remove only by EST'. But in Table 2, we may see there were no significant differences in both transverse diameter of the largest stone and number of stones in two groups, especially the stone size. So your explanation of this question doesn't make sense to me. 2, In particular, the statistical analysis of 'number of stones' between the two groups seems to be inappropriate (Table 2): 4.2 ± 9.5 (ND) vs 2.8 ± 3.6 (DD), especially in Group ND, the standard deviation value is far greater than the average. I guess the value of the dispersion was large, and I suggest extreme data should be excluded. 3, From your data, we may see that removal of stones in both groups are not quite satisfactory (38.2% vs 52.5%), I wonder what follow-up endoscopic treatment



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>

strategies you chose? 4, There were some grammatical mistakes or sentence structure problems; for example, in your discussion sections, you should use “.... Secondly,.... Thirdly,....”.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 27916

Title: Influence of night duty on endoscopic therapy for bile duct stones

Reviewer's code: 02500363

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Jing Yu

Date sent for review: 2016-06-23 09:58

Date reviewed: 2016-08-22 22:52

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"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] 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

Here are the comments on the ESPS Manuscript NO: 27916.

1. This study is helpful for the endoscopic to treat bile duct stones.
2. This study should provide more details of endoscopists on night duty , such as whether the endoscopists performe the surgery or not and the exact sleep time of the endoscopists on night duty.