



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 Radiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 12035

Title: Accuracy of magnetic resonance cholangiography compared to operative endoscopy, a single center experience, and literature review

Reviewer's code: 00041858

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2014-06-19 09:21

Date reviewed: 2014-07-02 00:28

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed 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 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		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Nicely written article. I recommend publication.



ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Radiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 12035

Title: Accuracy of magnetic resonance cholangiography compared to operative endoscopy, a single center experience, and literature review

Reviewer’s code: 02861055

Reviewer’s country: Italy

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2014-06-19 09:21

Date reviewed: 2014-07-02 18:16

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed 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 type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Polistina et al. submitted the manuscript entitled “Accuracy of magnetic resonance cholangiography compared to operative endoscopy, a single center experience, and literature review” for peer review. The paper is a retrospective study conducted on patients who underwent MRCP and subsequent ERCP for the study of biliary symptoms. The Authors compare the accuracy of the two interventions in the diagnosis of the biliary cause of the symptoms. A number of remarks are listed below: Major remarks: - The Authors should specify in the title that MRCP and ERCP are compared for accuracy in detecting biliary stones. - The review of literature appears to be a normal part of the discussion rather than an extensive evaluation of the current literature. The authors should expand this part with additional information (e.g. indications for MRCP and ERCP in specific clinical settings and complication rates). Alternatively, they should omit the “literature review” from Title and Methods. - The Authors should better explain how many patients received an ERCP because of abnormalities seen on MRCP (and with which concordance between the two procedures) and how many received ERCP because of persisting cholestasis. Moreover, clinical and laboratory findings of



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>

patients who underwent MRCP could be better summarized. Minor remarks: - The Authors should double check the reference list for accuracy and repetitions. - In Table 1, the Authors should state the parameters for which sensitivity and specificity are calculated. - The paper should be revised for grammatical errors, omissions and punctuation.



ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Radiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 12035

Title: Accuracy of magnetic resonance cholangiography compared to operative endoscopy, a single center experience, and literature review

Reviewer’s code: 02860814

Reviewer’s country: Greece

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2014-06-19 09:21

Date reviewed: 2014-06-29 16:45

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed 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"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input checked="" 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		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I read thoroughly the paper by Polistina et al regarding the accuracy of MRCP compared to operative endoscopy. The experience of this centre shows that choledocholithiasis is under diagnosed in MRCP, especially when the size of the biliary stones is less than 5mm diameter. This paper suffers from limitations especially in the bibliography used and cannot be considered for publication in this form. The authors have to get through the paper again, check the references that they used and changed them with more relevant and recent. ? Page 8 – 2nd paragraph: Percentage of sensitivity, specificity, and accuracy must be shown in the main text (not only in the Table 1). Are the differences among the diagnostic performance of MRCP and ERCP statistically significant? Please add the P-values of these comparisons. ? The authors start writing the “Discussion” as a review of the literature commenting on the advantages of gadoxetic disodium. However, this study is dealing mainly with a single center experience, so the discussion must begin with their results and comments on them. ? Page 9 – 1st paragraph: The authors use the references [11-14] as recent studies dealing with the use of contrast in MRCP. However, these papers are not recent. Besides, ref.13 and ref.14 are not dealing with the use



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>

of contrast. Indeed, there are more recent papers that should be discussed such as Lee et al at J Comput Assist Tomogr 2014, Choi et al at Clin Imaging 2014, Reiner et al at AJR Am J Roentgenol 2013, Kantarci et al at Eur Radiol 2013 and others. ? Page 10, lines 3-4: The sentence "These patients were initially asymptomatic on the blood test that showed normal values" must be changed to "These patients had initially normal blood tests" ? Page 10, 2nd paragraph: Ref.17-29, 27, 28 are not relevant, since there is no use of MRCP with contrast material in any of them. ? MRCP is an observer dependent method, so a comment on this fact should be added and discussed.