



# 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

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 27770

**Title:** Utility of endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography on biliopancreatic diseases in the patients with Billroth II-reconstructed stomach

**Reviewer's code:** 02551224

**Reviewer's country:** Italy

**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2016-06-17 17:01

**Date reviewed:** 2016-06-18 23:59

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

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear authors, as I wrote to the Editor, I think your paper on cholangiopancreatography in BII patients deserves publication, but only after a thorough revision of the English language, to make the text more intelligible and correct. What is needed is a different structure of sentences, that presently sound as a literal translation from a foreign language. Besides that, I would suggest also to compare the results of this technique in BII patients with the results in normal patients, and to discuss the problem in patients with Roux en Y reconstruction. I would also like to have a better exposure of the technical improvements introduced in last times, and a discussion of possible future improvements.



# 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

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 27770

**Title:** Utility of endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography on biliopancreatic diseases in the patients with Billroth II-reconstructed stomach

**Reviewer's code:** 00041963

**Reviewer's country:** Turkey

**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2016-06-17 17:01

**Date reviewed:** 2016-07-06 04:35

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"/> 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

Figure 1B and Figure 3C could be omit. Otherwise the manuscript is well written about endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography in the patients with Billroth II-reconstructed stomach which.



**ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 27770

**Title:** Utility of endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography on biliopancreatic diseases in the patients with Billroth II-reconstructed stomach

**Reviewer’s code:** 00503857

**Reviewer’s country:** Taiwan

**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2016-06-17 17:01

**Date reviewed:** 2016-07-26 23:08

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input checked="" 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**

The authors conducted a retrospective study regarding the issue of ERCP in the treatment of biliopancreatic disease in patients with Billroth-II gastrectomy. This topic is interesting; however, I have minor concerns of this manuscript. 1.The authors should provide a table showing the clinical characteristics of the included 26 patients, as mentioned in page 6. 2. Please make clear the definition of successful procedure in this study. The authors had better define successful procedure as reaching duodenal papilla+ successful biliary cannulation. 3.The author should also compare the results of successful procedure using either forward-viewing or side-viewing endoscope. 4.The authors might need some editorial help for English editing.