

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 23631

**Title:** Endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography (ERCP) in periampullary diverticulum: the challenge of cannulation

**Reviewer's code:** 03251500

**Reviewer's country:** Turkey

**Science editor:** Jing Yu

**Date sent for review:** 2015-12-07 12:39

**Date reviewed:** 2015-12-08 16:52

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" 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

Beginning of the article promised a good read but the text suddenly ended after shortly mentioning the therapeutic technics to be used. The mentioned therapeutic Technics in the text deserves a more detailed description in my idea, e.g. with their failure and success rates or ease and difficulty.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 23631

**Title:** Endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography (ERCP) in periampullary diverticulum: the challenge of cannulation

**Reviewer's code:** 03474653

**Reviewer's country:** Sweden

**Science editor:** Jing Yu

**Date sent for review:** 2015-12-07 12:39

**Date reviewed:** 2015-12-14 20:47

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 checked="" 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 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

First there is no numbers in the pages, then there is problem with how the pictures coming up on the pages, in the version that i can see, half of the images are disappeared. I miss title regarding the main body and method of the study. Abbreviation EUS is coming after the Word is used twice.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 23631

**Title:** Endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography (ERCP) in periampullary diverticulum: the challenge of cannulation

**Reviewer's code:** 03479389

**Reviewer's country:** Japan

**Science editor:** Jing Yu

**Date sent for review:** 2015-12-07 12:39

**Date reviewed:** 2015-12-09 23:15

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" 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

This article was described about ERCP cannulation in periampullary diverticulum (PAD). The success rates of endoscopic biliary cannulation for the patients with PAD seem to be different with the peri-diverticular papilla (PDP) or intra-diverticular papilla (IDP). Is there a difference in the biliary cannulation success rate of each technique between PAD and IDP? Which type of diverticulum is each technique for difficult cannulation useful for regardless of narrow or wide diverticular? Each explanation of the technique for difficult cannulation is the result of a few case report, and is the result enough to propose algorithm? Please describe the reason why each technique was successful or easy for the biliary cannulation in the patients with PAD.