

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Methodology*

**Manuscript NO:** 73634

**Title:** Single-use duodenoscopes for the prevention of ERCP-related cross-infection – from bench studies to clinical evidence

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited manuscript; externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05906378

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** China

**Author's Country/Territory:** Italy

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-11-28

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-11-30 01:02

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-11-30 03:36

**Review time:** 2 Hours

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Scientific quality</b> | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good<br><input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish            |
| <b>Language quality</b>   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing<br><input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection |
| <b>Conclusion</b>         | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority)<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection             |
| <b>Re-review</b>          | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No   |



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

|                                     |   |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| <b>Peer-reviewer<br/>statements</b> | Peer-Review: [ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] Anonymous [ <input type="radio"/> ] Onymous<br>Conflicts-of-Interest: [ <input type="radio"/> ] Yes [ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] No |
|-------------------------------------|---|

### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Single-use duodenoscopes for the prevention of ERCP-related cross-infection – from bench studies to clinical evidence The article is well written, having solid research objectives which need to be quantified, however I found some minor limitations which should be clarify before accepting of the manuscript Minor comments: 1. The bacterial name should be written an italic 2. Which guidelines you follow for performing meta-analysis? 3. Please mention the inclusion and exclusion criteria 4. Please mention the data analysis procedure 5. Please mention the type of contamination you found from systematic analysis 6. The types of multi drug resistant bacteria you found need to be mention as your study is based on clinically cross-infection, to identify their type, prevalent ratio and risk factors.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Methodology*

**Manuscript NO:** 73634

**Title:** Single-use duodenoscopes for the prevention of ERCP-related cross-infection – from bench studies to clinical evidence

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited manuscript; externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 03656580

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Postdoc, Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** China

**Author's Country/Territory:** Italy

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-11-28

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-12-13 02:50

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-12-13 06:05

**Review time:** 3 Hours

|                    |   |
|--------------------|---|
| Scientific quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good<br><input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish            |
| Language quality   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing<br><input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection |
| Conclusion         | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority)<br><input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection             |
| Re-review          | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No   |

**Peer-reviewer  
statements**Peer-Review: [ ☒ ] Anonymous [ ☐ ] OnymousConflicts-of-Interest: [ ☐ ] Yes [ ☒ ] No**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Authors reviewed the recent identification of several cluster of exogenous multidrug-resistant bacterial infection caused by duodenoscope cross-contamination necessitated the implementation of various strategies for at least prevention or abolition of that life-threatening risk. However, 1, the lack of a reliable quantification of the impact of duodenoscope contamination-related infections does not allow to correctly evaluate the benefit of the systematic use of a SUD on a cost/effective point of view. 2. critical discussion will be the ecological impact of production and wasting of a single-use endoscope. 3. SUDs are made from recycled plastic and are claimed to be recyclable through third party companies, even if material from these duodenoscopes will not be used for production of medical devices.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Methodology*

**Manuscript NO:** 73634

**Title:** Single-use duodenoscopes for the prevention of ERCP-related cross-infection – from bench studies to clinical evidence

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited manuscript; externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05400604

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** PharmD

**Professional title:** Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** China

**Author's Country/Territory:** Italy

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-11-28

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-12-17 06:52

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-12-17 08:53

**Review time:** 2 Hours

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Scientific quality</b> | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good<br><input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish            |
| <b>Language quality</b>   | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing<br><input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection |
| <b>Conclusion</b>         | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority)<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection             |
| <b>Re-review</b>          | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No   |



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

|                                     |   |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| <b>Peer-reviewer<br/>statements</b> | Peer-Review: [ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] Anonymous [ <input type="radio"/> ] Onymous<br>Conflicts-of-Interest: [ <input type="radio"/> ] Yes [ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] No |
|-------------------------------------|---|

### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

The paper by Lisotti A et al. presents a review of all available clinical evidence on the use of SUD for ERCP. The review summarizes available clinical evidence on the use of single-use duodenoscopes for ERCP. Authors quantified those outcomes and reviewed all ongoing studies in the field in order to identify which data will become available in the next future. On these bases, this article will represent a basic point for all future research in the field. Thank you for the opportunity to review the manuscript. The paper was well written. Few comments: 1. "In two cases (3.3%), cross-over to a reusable duodenoscope was required due to ERCP technical failure. " What's the technical failure? 2. "No difference was observed in term of adverse event (AE) and mortality, when ERCPs performed with the SUD were compared to those performed with a reusable duodenoscope." In this research, there seems no advantage of SUD for ERCP. 3. What is the approximate economic cost of SUD for ERCP? Limitations are not fully described.