

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 25020

**Title:** Comparison of endoscopic papillary balloon dilatation and endoscopic sphincterotomy for bile duct stones

**Reviewer's code:** 02550474

**Reviewer's country:** Argentina

**Science editor:** Ze-Mao Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2016-02-21 17:30

**Date reviewed:** 2016-02-21 22:19

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

Very Nice review. Complete And original. I would suggest to add in The discussion The percutaneous approach with balloon dilatation.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 25020

**Title:** Comparison of endoscopic papillary balloon dilatation and endoscopic sphincterotomy for bile duct stones

**Reviewer's code:** 00053417

**Reviewer's country:** China

**Science editor:** Ze-Mao Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2016-02-21 17:30

**Date reviewed:** 2016-02-22 18:45

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" 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"/> Duplicate publication	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		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

In this review article, the authors compare endoscopic papillary balloon dilatation and endoscopic sphincterotomy for bile duct stones. The idea is good. However, a series of similar review articles in the same topic have been published in this Journal (WJG) and many Journals (e.g. WJG 2015;2:7289, WJG 2014;20:5548, WJG 2013;19:8580, WJG 2013;19:8258, 2012;4:180, and BMC Gastroenterol. 2015;15:59, Gastroenterol Res Pract. 2015;2015:839346, Int J Clin Exp Med. 2015;8:8025). It is suggested to submit the paper to other relevant journals.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 25020

**Title:** Comparison of endoscopic papillary balloon dilatation and endoscopic sphincterotomy for bile duct stones

**Reviewer's code:** 00050424

**Reviewer's country:** Greece

**Science editor:** Ze-Mao Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2016-02-21 17:30

**Date reviewed:** 2016-02-28 04:32

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input 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 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 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 type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this review the authors discuss the reported differences in efficacy, safety and long term prognosis of EST and EPBD in patients with bile duct stones. I think that although they cite all the studies, they just report the results of each study separately without making any comment. No conclusion - suggestion is provided. There are at least two meta analyses published in recent years (one is just reported) the conclusions of which should be reported and analysed. The reader must understand, according to the accumulated evidence, which is the best method and which would be the suitable patient for each method.