

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 28739

Title: Clinical utility of 0.025-inch guidewire VisiGlide2™ in the ERCP-related procedures. –VIP2 study-

Reviewer's code: 03501077

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2016-07-18 13:50

Date reviewed: 2016-08-13 04:11

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input checked="" 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 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

The article is well written, the theme is clinically important. Only minor language corrections are necessary. I suggest to spend more words describing VisiGlide features and role. Discussion is quite long, useless sentences should be removed. Please increase the number of ERCP images.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 28739

Title: Clinical utility of 0.025-inch guidewire VisiGlide2™ in the ERCP-related procedures. –VIP2 study-

Reviewer's code: 03529651

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2016-07-18 13:50

Date reviewed: 2016-08-24 09:54

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input 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

This is a unique multicenter prospective study with a significant number of patients investigating an important topic, 0.025-inch guidewire VisiGlide2™ used for ERCP-related procedures as the first choice. The study results showed high accomplishment rate of procedure and low incidence of accidental symptoms. The results have a clinical impact on selecting the ideal guidewire that can accomplish the procedure by itself. This is a well-written article; the manuscript is concise, clear, comprehensive, and convincing.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 28739

Title: Clinical utility of 0.025-inch guidewire VisiGlide2™ in the ERCP-related procedures. –VIP2 study-

Reviewer's code: 01356099

Reviewer's country: Turkey

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2016-07-18 13:50

Date reviewed: 2016-08-24 13:06

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 checked="" 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 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

In this study the authors have compared two different types 0.025-inch guidewire (OLYMPUS - VisiGlide2™ and VisiGlide™). They found that success rate is high (97.5(197/202)% vs 92.3(180/195)%) in VisiGlide2™.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 28739

Title: Clinical utility of 0.025-inch guidewire VisiGlide2™ in the ERCP-related procedures. –VIP2 study-

Reviewer's code: 01438502

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2016-07-18 13:50

Date reviewed: 2016-08-26 23:34

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 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 checked="" 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

Dear Authors The thing which is a revised version of a product of the same company and becomes good for a dater of course is expected. Partiality is also seen by the angle type and the straight type about use comparison, and I can think that also influences in a result. But there is no detailed description about that. If possible, it may be difficult, but when there is comparison of use results with something of other companies, isn't it useful by a reader? If small description isn't about a conjurer, either, and an assistant occupies an important element for guide wire operation, and this description is not, and comparative number of cases is a colorful hand skill in about 300, to influence the success rate, I think the small explanation to need. I think when it's easier to understand when there is description about this. The result which you can be convinced seems when the result which you can be convinced is obtained when the difference to which I'm out is slight, and a significant difference collects number of cases further.