

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

ESPS manuscript NO: 21810

Title: Role of laparoscopic common bile duct exploration in the management of choledocholithiasis

Reviewer's code: 00071640

Reviewer's country: Turkey

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2015-09-01 10:19

Date reviewed: 2015-09-26 06:37

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" 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"/> 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 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

Dear authors. This manuscript is well written and informative.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

ESPS manuscript NO: 21810

Title: Role of laparoscopic common bile duct exploration in the management of choledocholithiasis

Reviewer's code: 01213502

Reviewer's country: Taiwan

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2015-09-01 10:19

Date reviewed: 2015-11-16 14:59

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input 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 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

This is a review article entitled "Role of Laparoscopic common bile duct exploration in the management of choledocholithiasis". The introduction, review literature and the discussion are all well-done. However, I cannot find the conclusion in the abstract. Suggest put the final conclusion as in the text briefly in the abstract. {...Both TC and TD approaches are safe and effective. TD stone extraction is associated with a higher risk of bile leaks and requires more expertise in intra-corporeal suturing and choledochoscopy. TC stone extraction seems a more accessible technique with lower complication rates. Choice depends on number of stones, size of stone, diameter of cystic duct and CBD. } By the way, the abbreviation must have a full spelling of medical term first in the text.

Abstract: Line 2 : ERCP line 6 Transcystic TC versus Transcholedochal TD