

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 32001

**Title:** Assessment of the July Effect in Post-ERCP Pancreatitis: Nationwide Inpatient Sample

**Reviewer's code:** 00068723

**Reviewer's country:** Japan

**Science editor:** Ze-Mao Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2016-12-23

**Date reviewed:** 2016-12-26

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 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

The authors investigated seasonal change of incidence of post-ERCP pancreatitis. The aim of this study was the affect of trainee to post-ERCP pancreatitis. There was no difference of incidence of post-ERCP pancreatitis according to early or late of the year. The aim was clear, and the results were useful. It was assumed that trainee did not affect the incidence as the authors stated. Incidence of complication possibly depended on the procedure. Were there any data available the ERCP was stratified to procedure? For example, with or without sphincterotomy, with or without cannulation to pancreatic duct, etc. If not, how did the authors speculate this point? Median income and primary insurance were interesting. Please explain the reason why the authors focused these factors. Was there possibility that incidence of post-ERCP pancreatitis was too low to be statistically significant?

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 32001

**Title:** Assessment of the July Effect in Post-ERCP Pancreatitis: Nationwide Inpatient Sample

**Reviewer's code:** 03648085

**Reviewer's country:** China

**Science editor:** Ze-Mao Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2016-12-23

**Date reviewed:** 2017-01-07

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 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

no

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 32001

**Title:** Assessment of the July Effect in Post-ERCP Pancreatitis: Nationwide Inpatient Sample

**Reviewer's code:** 03025323

**Reviewer's country:** Japan

**Science editor:** Ze-Mao Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2016-12-23

**Date reviewed:** 2017-01-07

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 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 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

This article is mentioned about difference in the incidence of PEP at academic institutions in the early versus the late academic year. I think that this paper is very interesting, because PEP is the most serious complication of ERCP, and we want to know whether the existence of the trainee effects this complication. But I think there are some problems. I would like to know the first operator of ERCP. If the first operator is trainer in the early academic year and is trainee in the late, I am easy to understand these results. I also would like to know how the teaching method is, though I think that it is difficult to know it because of retrospective cohort study. I would like to know the results in the middle academic year, too. The incidence of PEP may be the most high in this time possibly.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 32001

**Title:** Assessment of the July Effect in Post-ERCP Pancreatitis: Nationwide Inpatient Sample

**Reviewer's code:** 01804189

**Reviewer's country:** India

**Science editor:** Ze-Mao Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2016-12-23

**Date reviewed:** 2017-01-11

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 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

There is no doubt that trainee has less skill and confidence to do ERCP as compared to an expert. It is the supervision by the expert who prevents him committing the mistakes. Since this study is retrospective it is not possible to know to what extent the trainees were allowed to proceed. If a trainee is allowed for long time where he repeatedly tries to manipulate ampulla he will definitely land up in complications. It is not known in the whole study that to what extent the trainees were allowed to proceed. Whether any step wise program was followed where trainees were allowed for eg side viewing endoscopy for a particular time, cannulation for a particular time, intervening if more than four attempts at cannulation, allowing sphincterotomy after a particular no of successful cannulation etc,etc. is not clear from the study. It is a wrong message that ERCP by beginners is safe unless authors outline and give a detail guideline of the level of supervision. Authors should outline the various steps taken by supervisors to prevent complications. It is the person who is properly supervising the ERCP is responsible for



## BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

---

less complications rather than the trainee himself.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 32001

**Title:** Assessment of the July Effect in Post-ERCP Pancreatitis: Nationwide Inpatient Sample

**Reviewer's code:** 03475360

**Reviewer's country:** Poland

**Science editor:** Ze-Mao Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2016-12-23

**Date reviewed:** 2017-01-11

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

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The article concerns the occurrence of complications after endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography (ERCP) mostly of post-ERCP pancreatitis over the academic year. The similar papers concerning the complications in course of academic year are available in the literature for various therapeutic procedures. To the best of my knowledge it is the first in the world article concerning therapeutic endoscopy. In my opinion the aims of study are clear, the results and discussion are correct. I find this paper in terms of content suitable for publication in World Journal of Gastroenterology. However, some minor language errors must be fixed. Furthermore, I would like to know how teaching process looks in the involved institutions like. Also, I find the profile and difficulty level of ERCP procedures (biliary or pancreatic etc.) worth to be emphasized in the paper.