

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 61075

Title: Duplication of the common bile duct manifesting as recurrent pyogenic cholangitis:
A Case Report

Reviewer's code: 03538528

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: South Korea

Manuscript submission date: 2020-11-23

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ru Fan

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-11-26 12:39

Reviewer performed review: 2020-11-28 07:31

Review time: 1 Day and 18 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I appreciate the opportunity to review this case report. In this work, an extremely rare case of double common bile duct manifesting as recurrent pyogenic cholangitis was reported. There are several issues with the manuscript that need to be addressed. 1. As show in Fig1C, during the tubography following the first ERCP, the right hepatic duct was invisible. How can it be explained. Did the patient receive MRCP before discharged to conform the anatomy of the bile duct. If so, please provide the image. If not, please discuss the necessity in the discussion part. 2. During the second ERCP, only the stone impacted at the ampulla was removed. Remnant stones were confirmed by the following MRCP, which lead to a third ERCP. Did the patient receive tubography after placement of the biliary drainage tube during the second ERCP. If remnant stones were confirmed by tubography during the second ERCP, the third ERCP could be avoided. Please provide tubography image of the second ERCP. If not, please discuss this issue in the discussion part. 3. There are several grammatical mistakes in the manuscript. 3.1 In the background part: Among them, Type V, which is characterized by single drainage of the extrahepatic bile ducts, only scare reports have been reported so far. Two subjects exist in this sentence. 3.2 In the core tip part: Although this is a rare condition, our case highlights the importance of recognizing DCBD, because stones in the unrecognized bile duct could make patient's prognosis critical. Two space keys exist before the words our case. 3.3 In the imaging examination part: A CT scan demonstrated another dilated extrahepatic bile duct draining the right lobe of the liver, that also contained stones in the distal portion (Fig. 2A). The word that should be changed to which. 4. Abbreviations need to be defined only when they first appear in the text.