

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Pathophysiology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 7025

Title: REVIEW ARTICLE: PREVENTION OF POST-ERCP PANCREATITIS

Reviewer code: 00505493

Science editor: Wen, Ling-Ling

Date sent for review: 2013-11-02 20:00

Date reviewed: 2013-11-05 02:37

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	language polishing	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

My compliment for the essentiality and the StyleWriter . The MessageS are effective and immediately acquired from the reader . Pay attention to references list . There is a counter mistake be tween 31 and 32 that probably involve all the following references!

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Pathophysiology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 7025

Title: REVIEW ARTICLE: PREVENTION OF POST-ERCP PANCREATITIS

Reviewer code: 00033012

Science editor: Wen, Ling-Ling

Date sent for review: 2013-11-02 20:00

Date reviewed: 2013-11-14 00:03

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	language polishing	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This clinical review paper reads very well and will be useful to all performing ERCP. I disagree with the statement that 5 fr stents do not provide benefits of pancreatitis reduction. If you search the literature there are studies showing the benefits of 5 fr stents. 3 fr adds to the cost and you often need a different wire that is smaller for its placement. Many US endoscopists routinely use just 5 fr stents and believe their pancreatitis rates are lower.