

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242

**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com https://www.wjgnet.com

# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Manuscript NO: 45623

Title: Age, socioeconomic features, and clinical factors predict receipt of endoscopic

retrograde cholangiopancreatography in pancreatic cancer

Reviewer's code: 02917331

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Ying Dou

Date sent for review: 2019-01-14

**Date reviewed:** 2019-01-15

**Review time:** 1 Hour, 1 Day

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	[ ] Accept	Peer-Review:
[Y] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	[Y] Anonymous
[ ] Grade C: Good	polishing	[Y] Accept	[ ] Onymous
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
[ ] Grade E: Do not	language polishing	[ ] Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	[ ] Grade D: Rejection	[ ] Major revision	[ ] Advanced
		[ ] Rejection	[Y] General
			[ ] No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			[ ] Yes
			[ Y] No

# SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting and well-written review article regarding geographic, racial, socioeconomic and clinical factors associated with utilization of ERCP in US. This article contains beneficial information for the WJGE readers.



7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242

**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com https://www.wjgnet.com

# INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

G	oogle Search:
[	] The same title
[	] Duplicate publication
[	] Plagiarism
[Y	] No
В	PG Search:
[	] The same title
[	] Duplicate publication
[	] Plagiarism
ſΥ	'l No



7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242

**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com https://www.wjgnet.com

# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Manuscript NO: 45623

Title: Age, socioeconomic features, and clinical factors predict receipt of endoscopic

retrograde cholangiopancreatography in pancreatic cancer

Reviewer's code: 03706560

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Ying Dou

Date sent for review: 2019-01-14

**Date reviewed:** 2019-01-17

**Review time:** 11 Hours, 3 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	[ ] Accept	Peer-Review:
[Y] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	[Y] Anonymous
[ ] Grade C: Good	polishing	[ ] Accept	[ ] Onymous
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
[ ] Grade E: Do not	language polishing	[Y] Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	[ ] Grade D: Rejection	[ ] Major revision	[Y] Advanced
		[ ] Rejection	[ ] General
			[ ] No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			[ ] Yes
			[ Y] No

# SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

First, I would like to congratulate the authors for the manuscript "Age, Socioeconomic Features, and Clinical Factors Predict Receipt of ERCP in Pancreatic Cancer". This is a well written retrospective study evaluating predictors of ERCP in patients with



7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,

Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242

**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243

**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com **https**://www.wjgnet.com

pancreatic cancer in the US. However, some concerns need to be addressed: 1. Introduction: Very good. Short and precise. - You need to be more precise in the paragraph with the references (6-14). Among patients who underwent resection, only geographic location was independently associated with survival, with patients in the Northeast, Midwest and Pacific West faring better than patients in the Southeast (References???) Other studies suggest racial disparities in pancreatic cancer care: black patients fare worse than white patients in both utilization of treatment modalities and survival (References???) 2. Methods: The methods are very well written. - Figure 1 is a result and not method. 3. Results: The results are well written and confirmed what everyone already believes. It is great to have a study supporting our thoughts. 4. Discussion: The discussion is quite good but is not amazing. - I do not think this is a limitation "Finally, this study includes patients who are more often female than the general PC population". This is a result of your analysis. - I do not think your result showed this "These results highlight the need to identify appropriate candidates for ERCP in pancreatic cancer and address barriers to endoscopic interventions for suitable pancreatic cancer patients." You did not identify appropriate candidates in your analysis! I suggest you modify your conclusion in the discussion session for the same conclusion of the abstract "ERCP utilization in pancreatic cancer varies based on patient age, marital status, and factors related to where the patient lives. Further studies are needed to guide appropriate biliary intervention for these patients". In summary, I do think this manuscript should be published after revision, mainly related to you last sentence in the discussion section.

#### INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

[ ] The same title



7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
<b>Telephone:</b> +1-925-223-8242
<b>Fax:</b> +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

[	] Duplicate publication
[	] Plagiarism
[Y	] No

R	D	$\mathcal{C}$	Search:
n	-	lΤ	Seurch.

[	] The same title
[	] Duplicate publication
[	] Plagiarism
[Y	'] No