



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 107810

**Title:** Strategies for achieving successful cannulation in ERCP: A technical overview

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05251368

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree and professional title:** Assistant Professor, MD

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** United States

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2025-03-28

**Reviewer chosen by:** Shang Wu

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2025-04-07 09:45

**Reviewer performed review:** 2025-04-09 02:11

**Review time:** 1 Day and 16 Hours

|                               |   |
|-------------------------------|---|
| <b>Content to be reviewed</b> | Does the manuscript's content fall within the scope of the journal? <b>Yes</b><br>Do authors' affiliations correspond to the content of the manuscript? <b>Yes</b><br>Is there any Key Word that is not included in the manuscript title? <b>No</b><br>Does the Abstract contain the contents of each part of the manuscript (IMRaD)? <b>Yes</b><br>Are the Key Words complete? <b>Yes</b><br>Is the content of the Introduction adequate? <b>Not</b> |
|-------------------------------|---|



# Baishideng Publishing Group

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

## **Applicable**

Is the content of the Materials and Methods complete?

## **Not Applicable**

Is the description of the experiments clear and complete? **Not Applicable**

Is the manuscript's text correct, concise, and clear? **Yes**

Do authors only cite their own earlier publications? **No**

Are all references related to the topic of the manuscript? **Yes**

Do authors omit important references? **No**

Are all references necessary and reasonable? **Yes**

Is the Conclusion reasonable? **Yes**

Is the content of the Discussion reasonable? **Yes**

Are the figures and tables numbered consecutively in the order in which they appear in the manuscript? **Yes**

Are the experimental data of the Results true and reliable? **Not Applicable**

Are the experimental data presented in the manuscript's biostatistics content reliable? **Not**

## **Applicable**

Are the quality and resolution of the images up to standard? **Yes**

Do the selection and design of the figures and tables follow the principles of necessity and clarity? **Yes**

Is there any duplication between various parts of the manuscript and between the main text and the content presented in the figures and tables? **Yes**

Will the manuscript's content be of interest to readers? **No**

Are additional experiments needed for the study? **No**



|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | Does the research scope comply with ethics? <b>Not Applicable</b> |
| Scientific quality  | Grade C (Good)  |
| Novelty of this manuscript  | Grade C (Good)  |
| Creativity or innovation of this manuscript                             | Grade C (Good)  |
| Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript            | Grade C (Good)  |
| Language quality  | Grade C (Good)  |
| Does this manuscript describe a study of the existing knowledge system? | Yes   |
| Does this manuscript report a revolutionary innovation?                 | No  |
| Does this manuscript report an unconventional innovation?               | No  |
| Conclusion  | Minor revision  |
| Re-review   | Yes   |
| Peer-reviewer statements  | Peer-Review: Anonymous  |
|   | Conflicts-of-Interest: No   |

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I had read this review with interest and have to say that although this is a useful review in terms of understanding the difficulties encountered during ERCP and the trouble shooting for such difficult cases I find that there is a little more than needed information and text in the review. The review has lot of information and too much of general detail. For example it is exhausting and tiring to read the full depth and breadth of the anatomy of the ampulla and the normal techniques before the reader gets to the actual topic which is the difficult ERCP , the most likley causes and how to navigate through such



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA

**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568

**E-mail:** office@baishideng.com

**https://**www.wjgnet.com

scenarios. Also some of the text to me sounded like redundant and not needed. For example the authors had mentioned about the biliary system and did mention that "Bile, a digestive fluid produced by the liver, is initially collected by narrow canaliculi from each hepatocyte and then funneled into intralobular bile ducts, which drain individual liver lobules. These intralobular ducts merge into interlobular ducts situated between lobules, eventually forming the right and left hepatic ducts that serve the liver's respective lobes; the caudate lobe is drained by ducts from both sides. Outside the liver, these ducts join to form the common hepatic duct, which, after meeting the cystic duct from the gallbladder, becomes the common bile duct (CBD)". I believe that the readers are well aware of the anatomy part and that this would lose the reader from the main content of the review. There are a couple of areas in the discussion that could be avoided. Finally the advanced cannulation techniques are well described and I suggest the authors to please revise the manuscript in removing the redundant portions of the basic anatomy and highlight the important part of the review. That way the reader will not be tired and lose interest before they get to the actual content of the review.