

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 24914

Title: Electrocautery vs non-electrocautery dilation catheters in endoscopic ultrasonography-guided pancreatic fluid collection drainage

Reviewer's code: 00001832

Reviewer's country: Germany

Science editor: Jin-Xin Kong

Date sent for review: 2016-02-16 08:20

Date reviewed: 2016-03-18 00:39

| 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 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

The manuscript by Kitamura and co-workers analyzes retrospectively electrocautery versus non-electrocautery dilation catheter in endoscopic ultrasonography-guided pancreatic fluid collection drainage. 28 patients (15 versus 13) were included in their analysis. The authors conclude from their data that the use of an electrocautery dilation catheter appears safe and contributes to a shorter procedure time. The manuscript is generally well written. The data are of interest, although it is a rather specialized topic. The major drawbacks are the retrospective nature of the study and the small cohort size. Any conclusion from the study has to be interpreted very cautiously. ? Since the authors started without electrocautery and later introduced electrocautery, the difference in procedure time might have been related to experience with the procedure and not to the use of electrocautery. ? Could the authors plot procedure time over the years? Second, could the authors provide data regarding the time of the different steps of the procedure(s), e.g. how much time was used for dilatation in both groups. ? The benefit from electrocautery should be a reduction of bleeding complications, one would assume. However, no bleeding complication was encountered in



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

either group.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 24914

Title: Electrocautery vs non-electrocautery dilation catheters in endoscopic ultrasonography-guided pancreatic fluid collection drainage

Reviewer's code: 00227359

Reviewer's country: Turkey

Science editor: Jin-Xin Kong

Date sent for review: 2016-02-16 08:20

Date reviewed: 2016-03-17 01:07

| 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input checked="" 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

Authors carried out total 28 EUS guided PFC drainage after 2010. In the first group, they did not use electrocautery (between 2010 and 2012) and performed the procedures with a mean 52 minutes. After this experience (2012 - today) they changed their technique and did the procedure with an electrocautery with a mean 30 minutes. They concluded that the second technique contributed to a shorter procedure time. How did the authors eliminated the learning curve effect of the procedure? The shorter procedure time can also be attributed to the increased experience of the clinicians.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 24914

Title: Electrocautery vs non-electrocautery dilation catheters in endoscopic ultrasonography-guided pancreatic fluid collection drainage

Reviewer's code: 02446368

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Jin-Xin Kong

Date sent for review: 2016-02-16 08:20

Date reviewed: 2016-03-21 18:19

| 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"/> Duplicate publication | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected | 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

A Good job.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 24914

Title: Electrocautery vs non-electrocautery dilation catheters in endoscopic ultrasonography-guided pancreatic fluid collection drainage

Reviewer's code: 00503834

Reviewer's country: Taiwan

Science editor: Jin-Xin Kong

Date sent for review: 2016-02-16 08:20

Date reviewed: 2016-03-25 01:42

| 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"/> Duplicate publication | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected | <input 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 type="checkbox"/> No | |

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript is related to electrocautery vs non-electrocautery dilation catheter in endoscopic ultrasonography-guided pancreatic fluid collections drainage. The manuscript is a simple, unremarkable, and retrospective analysis. It concluded that electrocautery dilatation catheter is as effective as non-electrocautery dilatation catheter. I have several comments: 1. In each case, the authors used both internal and external drainage. But, the clinical failure rate was larger than 30%. It may indicate that such treatment is not superior to traditional percutaneous drainage. How did the authors explain about the higher failure rate. 2. The benefits of percutaneous drainage are the drainage tube may be with larger diameter, thus better drainage would be achieved. The authors may add a paragraph for discussion about this. Besides, how about the cost-effective EUS drainage vs percutaneous drainage. 3. The of EUS drainage could provide a more comfortable drainage compared with percutaneous drainage.