

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy*

Manuscript NO: 79298

Title: Current approaches and questions yet to be resolved for the prophylaxis of post-endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography pancreatitis

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06120769

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Japan

Manuscript submission date: 2022-08-14

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-08-14 11:17

Reviewer performed review: 2022-08-23 14:06

Review time: 9 Days and 2 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" 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="radio"/>] Anonymous [<input type="radio"/>] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [<input type="radio"/>] Yes [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

There are nearly ten publications of reviews about PEP following ERCP. Among them, the article titled as "Non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs, intravenous fluids, pancreatic stents, or their combinations for the prevention of post-endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography pancreatitis: a systematic review and network meta-analysis" (PMID: 34214449 DOI: 10.1016/S2468-1253(21)00170-9), has systematically discussed the efficacy of combined treatment. So, it is not logical for the author to describe that "To date, there are no established methods to estimate the synergistic effect of the independent risk factors on post-endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography (ERCP) pancreatitis (PEP), and evidence of the efficacy of the combination of prophylactic measures for PEP is scarce. " More importantly, the present manuscript does not discuss the synergistic effect of the independent risk factors on PEP. Please add the important content. So, the manuscript did not exhibit its novelty.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy*

Manuscript NO: 79298

Title: Current approaches and questions yet to be resolved for the prophylaxis of post-endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography pancreatitis

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06349034

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Japan

Manuscript submission date: 2022-08-14

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-09-01 04:36

Reviewer performed review: 2022-09-05 15:08

Review time: 4 Days and 10 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 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
Conclusion	<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
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

**Peer-reviewer
statements**Peer-Review: [☒] Anonymous [☐] OnymousConflicts-of-Interest: [☐] Yes [☒] No**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

It is an essential contemporary topic and is well addressed in this manuscript. The manuscript, I presume, will enrich current knowledge on this topic. However, I would suggest minor alterations to the manuscript title to make it more appealing. Suggested title: Current approaches and questions yet to be resolved for the prophylaxis of post-endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography pancreatitis.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy*

Manuscript NO: 79298

Title: Current approaches and questions yet to be resolved for the prophylaxis of post-endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography pancreatitis

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05393105

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: Doctor, FRCP, MBBS, MD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: Japan

Manuscript submission date: 2022-08-14

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-09-06 13:50

Reviewer performed review: 2022-09-06 15:15

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<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
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="radio"/>] Anonymous [<input type="radio"/>] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [<input type="radio"/>] Yes [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] No
-------------------------------------	---

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

A mini review but well compiled. The following are the suggestions to improve the manuscript: 1. All guidelines on the subject to be out in a tabular form 2. Summary of important systematic reviews and meta analysis to be provided 3. The following references be added to enhance the discussion : a. Choudhary A, Bechtold ML, Arif M, Szary NM, Puli SR, Othman MO, Pais WP, Antillon MR, Roy PK. Pancreatic stents for prophylaxis against post-ERCP pancreatitis: a meta-analysis and systematic review. *Gastrointestinal Endoscopy* 2011; 73(2): 275-282 b. Fan JH, Qian JB, Wang YM, Shi RH, Zhao CJ. Updated meta-analysis of pancreatic stent placement in preventing post-endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography pancreatitis. *World J Gastroenterol*. 2015 Jun 28;21(24):7577-83. c. Katalin Márta, Noémi Gede, Zsolt Szakács, Margit Solymár, Péter Jenő Hegyi, Bálint Tél, Bálint Erőss, Áron Vincze, Marianna Arvanitakis, Ivo Boškoski, Marco J. Bruno, Péter Hegyi, Combined use of indomethacin and hydration is the best conservative approach for post-ERCP pancreatitis prevention: A network meta-analysis, *Pancreatology*, Volume 21, Issue 7, 2021, Pages 1247-1255, d. Xiang Ding, FuCheng Zhang, YaoJun Wang, Risk factors for post-ERCP pancreatitis: A systematic review and meta-analysis, *The Surgeon*, Volume 13, Issue 4, 2015, Pages 218-229,

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy*

Manuscript NO: 79298

Title: Current approaches and questions yet to be resolved for the prophylaxis of post-endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography pancreatitis

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03474273

Position: Associate Editor

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Chief Doctor, Director, Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Japan

Manuscript submission date: 2022-08-14

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-09-05 00:44

Reviewer performed review: 2022-09-11 02:27

Review time: 6 Days and 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] Anonymous [<input type="radio"/>] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [<input type="radio"/>] Yes [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] No
-------------------------------------	---

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The simple review by Saito H. et al summarized current measures to prevent PEP. However, the review was not well structured and many important factors were missing.

1. Some content in the "Risk factors" section and "Patients selection" sections are repetition.
2. The role of endoscopists in the development of PEP should not be included in patients selection.
3. The role ERCP techniques (EPT vs large balloon dilation, the duration of balloon dilation, et al.) were missing.
4. Hydration lacks references to further discuss it.
5. The type of NASID may also plays a different role in preventing PEP (indometacin vs indometacin).
6. The controversial role of somatostatin should be discussed.
7. The authors should draw a flowchart to clarify how to prevent PEP, from patient selection to post-ERCP measures.
8. Most importantly, many reviews have been published on this issue and nothing new found in this review.