



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Manuscript NO: 46062

Title: Appropriate number of biliary biopsies and ERCP sessions for diagnosing biliary tract cancer

Reviewer's code: 02551224

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Jin-Lei Wang

Date sent for review: 2019-01-27

Date reviewed: 2019-01-28

Review time: 2 Hours, 1 Day

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 Grade E: Do not publish	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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Authors, the article "appropriate number of biliary biopsies and ERCP sessions for diagnosing biliary tract cancer", by Tadayuki Takagi et al, is a retrospective study trying to clarify the exact number of biopsies and ERCP sessions required for the diagnosis of



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

biliary tract cancer. As honestly recognized in the text, the retrospective nature of the study, the low sample size and the absence of indications regarding the volumes of the specimens sampled by biliary biopsies are important limitations to the predictive power of the study. The only conclusion that can be drawn is the fact that ERCP should be performed only once, and followed by other more accurate diagnostic modalities. With this limitation in mind, the study can be useful to give an indication to specialists involved in the diagnosis of biliary tract cancer. It is well written in English language and does not require language revision.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

BPG Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, 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: 46062

Title: Appropriate number of biliary biopsies and ERCP sessions for diagnosing biliary tract cancer

Reviewer's code: 01799104

Reviewer's country: Taiwan

Science editor: Jin-Lei Wang

Date sent for review: 2019-01-27

Date reviewed: 2019-02-16

Review time: 17 Hours, 19 Days

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors clarified that for the diagnosis of bile duct cancer only one ERCP is recommended if there is no conclusion though the brush cytology or biopsy. The finding is informative. There are few minor concerns in your article. First, did you use SpyGlass



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

choledochoscope in your series? If yes, you did not mention that in the method since there is one patient in N-group underwent choledochoscopy. If not, why you put it in your discussion? Second, is there any statistical bias in your conclusion because of small sample size (table 2)?

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

BPG Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No