



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

**Manuscript NO:** 81268

**Title:** Current management of concomitant cholelithiasis and common bile duct stones

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05848564

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Reviewer\_Country

**Author's Country/Territory:** Greece

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-11-04

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-11-06 08:37

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-11-11 17:22

**Review time:** 5 Days and 8 Hours

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 Grade E: Do not publish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



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://www.wjgnet.com**

statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [ <b>Y</b> ] No
------------	--

### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Several meta-analyses have compared single-stage with two-stage management without a reliable conclusion, considering that the two therapeutic strategies are equally safe and feasible for the management of concomitant CBD stones and gallstones. A debate still exist, this MiniReview evaluated the current management options of concomitant gallbladder and CBD stones, highlighting the updated knowledge. I have only one minor revision: For rendez-vous thecnique you correctly cite the article of Lin Y. underline the longer operative time of the technique. However, there is a recent article of Lagoucardou et al. in which they demonstrate the significantly shorter time of endoscopic time in rendezvous groups when compared with the two-stage approach. Please cite this paper: Lagouvardou E, Martines G, Tomasicchio G, Laforgia R, Pezzolla A, Caputi Iambrenghi O. Laparo-endoscopic management of chole-choledocholithiasis: Rendezvous or intraoperative ERCP? A single tertiary care center experience. *Front Surg.* 2022 Aug 31;9:938962. doi: 10.3389/fsurg.2022.938962. PMID: 36117813; PMCID: PMC9470774



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

**Manuscript NO:** 81268

**Title:** Current management of concomitant cholelithiasis and common bile duct stones

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05118195

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Staff Physician, Surgeon, Surgical Oncologist

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Spain

**Author's Country/Territory:** Greece

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-11-04

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-11-12 08:42

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-11-20 11:10

**Review time:** 8 Days and 2 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://www.wjgnet.com**

statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [ <b>Y</b> ] No
------------	--

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

The abstract length is too long. It would be interesting if it would be shortened. It is notice the absence of figures illustrating the manuscript. The inclusion of some images will make the article less rough to read. In the Introduction page 4 it is said "A study from the USA found that laparoscopic cholecystectomy...was better than preoperative MRCP in terms of effectiveness and cost analysis [7]". It is not cleared what it was better for. This study was based in a mathematical model but the practical consequences of the article are not defined.