



**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**

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 104618

**Title:** Results of endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography procedures at surgical clinics: A multicenter observational study in Türkiye

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 03033129

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree and professional title:** Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2024-12-31

**Reviewer chosen by:** Hong-Xin Jiang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2025-01-06 07:59

**Reviewer performed review:** 2025-01-07 11:10

**Review time:** 1 Day and 3 Hours

<b>Content to be reviewed</b>	
<b>Scientific quality</b>	Grade C (Good)
<b>Novelty of this manuscript</b>	Grade B (Very Good)
<b>Creativity or innovation of this manuscript</b>	Grade C (Good)
<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	Grade B (Very Good)
<b>Language quality</b>	Grade A (Excellent)



Does this manuscript describe a study of the existing knowledge system?	No
Does this manuscript report a revolutionary innovation?	No
Does this manuscript report an unconventional innovation?	No
<b>Conclusion</b>	Accept
<b>Re-review</b>	No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: Anonymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: No

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

The article clearly stated that there is a big gap and deficiency regarding doctors who perform Endoscopic retrograd cholangiography and as shown here, a large number of Endoscopic retrograd cholangiography have been performed and it has been a study that has shown many positive results such as cannulisation success, fewer complications and similar results in line with the literature. It has been a study that will guide the literature, especially in terms of increasing the number of doctors who perform Endoscopic retrograd cholangiography and ensuring that it can be performed safely, The title of the study is appropriate and indicating a large number of patients. The keywords express characteristic elements and fully reflect the main content of the article. The introduction explains the consensus and theory on the topic, clarifies any currently unknown issues or questions about the topic, indicates critical issues to be addressed, and states the purpose of the study. The study is logical and coherent from Title to Conclusion. The hypothesis of the study is valid. The results of the study support the conclusion. The most important finding of the study is clearly stated. The implications of the study for the future are clearly stated. The sources of the article are consistent with



**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](https://www.wjgnet.com)

the subject matter. The article contains references to important and relevant articles published in the last 3-10 years. Important references are present in the reference list of the article. The authors cite their own published articles appropriately in the content of the article. The references are applied in the text in order. Abbreviations are used correctly in the article. There are no spelling or grammatical errors in the article. The study is logical and coherent from Title to Conclusion. The hypothesis of the study is valid. The results of the study support the conclusion. The most important finding of the study is clearly stated. The implications of the study for the future are clearly stated.  
thank you .



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 104618

**Title:** Results of endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography procedures at surgical clinics: A multicenter observational study in Türkiye

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 08351041

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

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

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2024-12-31

**Reviewer chosen by:** Hong-Xin Jiang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2025-02-11 17:34

**Reviewer performed review:** 2025-02-11 18:38

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<b>Content to be reviewed</b>	Does the manuscript's content fall within the scope of the journal? <b>Yes</b> Is there any Key Word that is not included in the manuscript title? <b>Yes</b> Does the Abstract contain the contents of each part of the manuscript (IMRaD)? <b>Yes</b> Are the Key Words complete? <b>Yes</b> Is the content of the Introduction adequate? <b>Yes</b> Is the content of the Materials and Methods complete?
-------------------------------	---



# 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**

	<p><b>No</b></p> <p>Is the description of the experiments clear and complete? <b>Yes</b></p> <p>Are the experimental data presented in the manuscript's biostatistics content reliable? <b>No</b></p> <p>Are the experimental data of the Results true and reliable? <b>Yes</b></p> <p>Are the quality and resolution of the images up to standard? <b>Yes</b></p> <p>Do the selection and design of the figures and tables follow the principles of necessity and clarity? <b>Yes</b></p> <p>Is the content of the Discussion reasonable? <b>No</b></p> <p>Is the Conclusion reasonable? <b>Yes</b></p> <p>Are all references necessary and reasonable? <b>Yes</b></p> <p>Do authors omit important references? <b>Yes</b></p> <p>Are all references related to the topic of the manuscript? <b>Yes</b></p> <p>Do authors only cite their own earlier publications? <b>No</b></p> <p>Is the manuscript's text correct, concise, and clear? <b>Yes</b></p> <p>Will the manuscript's content be of interest to readers? <b>Yes</b></p> <p>Are additional experiments needed for the study? <b>No</b></p> <p>Does the research scope comply with ethics? <b>Yes</b></p>
<b>Scientific quality</b>	Grade C (Good)
<b>Novelty of this manuscript</b>	Grade D (Fair)
<b>Creativity or innovation of this manuscript</b>	Grade D (Fair)
<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	Grade D (Fair)



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	Major revision
Re-review	Yes
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: Anonymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: No

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Authors presented a large-scale observational data on endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography (ERCP) with a sufficient number of patients. It seems that this study will be valuable for the literature. In particular, the side effects seen may be an important guide for physicians performing the same procedure. Some changes, additions and corrections need to be made in the study. 1. Although the English and spelling is generally understood, it needs to be corrected by a native English-speaking general surgeon or medical specialist. 2. Each abbreviation used in the study is not necessarily given in its long form. This includes abbreviations in tables. 3. There is no statistical method in the method section. It should be added. 4. Even if it is submitted as an additional file, the institution granting ethics committee approval, ethics committee approval number and ethics committee meeting date should be written in the method section. 5. Additional statistical analysis should be performed on the side effects seen in the study. For example, they should all be analyzed individually in terms of complications seen. For example, which patient group had the most bleeding. Since there



**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

is more than one disease, one way anova method should be used to see if there is a difference in terms of bleeding. 6. The effect of gender on complications should be analyzed by student t or mann whitney u test. Or analyze whether there is a relationship between general anesthesia or sedation and complications. At least complications should be analyzed in terms of gender, type of anesthesia. It is important whether there is a difference in complications due to gender or complications due to anesthesia. It may guide the surgeons who will read the article in the choice of anesthesia. It also shows the possibilities that may be observed in male-female gender in this method used. 7. The discussion should be rewritten with the new findings. In addition, the limitations of the study should be added. For example, did the patients smoke or take any chronic medication. In addition, precautions that can be taken in advance or before the procedure against possible complications should be mentioned in the discussion. 8. The authors have put a lot of effort and have presented a very adequate number of patients. However, their findings contain only descriptive and percentage expressions. This makes it more like a short letter to the editor than an article. This problem can be addressed by performing additional statistical analysis in this valuable study and discussing this situation in the discussion.



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

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

**Manuscript NO:** 104618

**Title:** Results of endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography procedures at surgical clinics: A multicenter observational study in Türkiye

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer’s code:** 02942858

**Position:** Editorial Board

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

**Reviewer’s Country/Territory:** Egypt

**Author’s Country/Territory:** Türkiye

**Manuscript submission date:** 2024-12-31

**Reviewer chosen by:** Hong-Xin Jiang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2025-02-11 08:09

**Reviewer performed review:** 2025-02-15 20:56

**Review time:** 4 Days and 12 Hours

<b>Content to be reviewed</b>	<p>Does the manuscript’s content fall within the scope of the journal? <b>Yes</b></p> <p>Is there any Key Word that is not included in the manuscript title? <b>Yes</b></p> <p>Do authors’ affiliations correspond to the content of the manuscript? <b>Yes</b></p> <p>Does the Abstract contain the contents of each part of the manuscript (IMRaD)? <b>Yes</b></p> <p>Are the Key Words complete? <b>Yes</b></p>
-------------------------------	--



# 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**

	<p>Is the content of the Introduction adequate? <b>Yes</b></p> <p>Is the content of the Materials and Methods complete? <b>Yes</b></p> <p>Is the description of the experiments clear and complete? <b>Yes</b></p> <p>Are the experimental data presented in the manuscript's biostatistics content reliable? <b>Yes</b></p> <p>Are the experimental data of the Results true and reliable? <b>Yes</b></p> <p>Are the quality and resolution of the images up to standard? <b>Yes</b></p> <p>Do the selection and design of the figures and tables follow the principles of necessity and clarity? <b>Yes</b></p> <p>Is the content of the Discussion reasonable? <b>Yes</b></p> <p>Is the Conclusion reasonable? <b>Yes</b></p> <p>Are all references necessary and reasonable? <b>Yes</b></p> <p>Do authors omit important references? <b>No</b></p> <p>Are all references related to the topic of the manuscript? <b>Yes</b></p> <p>Do authors only cite their own earlier publications? <b>No</b></p> <p>Is the manuscript's text correct, concise, and clear? <b>Yes</b></p> <p>Will the manuscript's content be of interest to readers? <b>Yes</b></p> <p>Are additional experiments needed for the study? <b>No</b></p> <p>Does the research scope comply with ethics? <b>Yes</b></p>
<b>Scientific quality</b>	Grade C (Good)
<b>Novelty of this manuscript</b>	Grade D (Fair)
<b>Creativity or innovation of this manuscript</b>	Grade D (Fair)



<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	Grade C (Good)
<b>Language quality</b>	Grade B (Very good)
<b>Does this manuscript describe a study of the existing knowledge system?</b>	Yes
<b>Does this manuscript report a revolutionary innovation?</b>	No
<b>Does this manuscript report an unconventional innovation?</b>	No
<b>Conclusion</b>	Minor revision
<b>Re-review</b>	No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: Anonymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: No

**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

The results of 66993 endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography procedures at fourteen surgical clinics, a multicenter observational study in Türkiye. General comments: The idea of the research is good. This manuscript highlights an important aspect. The present paper showed the results of all ERCP procedures performed at the fourteen general surgery centers. The surgical ERCP units in the present work have reached satisfactory results and provided reliable and successful ERCP service. The article contains a very broad and multi-centered case series. It has a guiding and educational feature for general surgery specialists and assistants who perform ERCP procedures. Current problems are being addressed and a direction is being proposed for future development. The manuscript is well written. However, there are some typing mistakes. Detailed comments Abstract results Hyperamylasemia and the post-ERCP pancreatitis (PEP) were the most common complication as observed at 8.1% of the



**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

patients Please corrected to 8.2 Results: Hyperamylasemia and post-ERCP pancreatitis (PEP) were the most common complication as observed at 8.1% consistent with the literature Please corrected to 8.1 to 8.2 The complication rate should be below 6% according to BSG and it is 5.6% in this study (Table 3). How? Complication total is 10.2 and should be corrected to (10.1%) If you mean major complications only You should write this and name the complications you mean which give this percentage 5.6% Hyperamylasemia and the post-ERCP pancreatitis (PEP) were the most common complication as observed at 8.1% consistent with the literature. Please correct 8.1 to 8.2 The rate of hyperamilacemia in this study is 4.6% and is consistent with the literatures Please correct 4.6% to 4.7% correct hyperamilacemia to hyperamylasemia literatures to literature In this study, 0.8% of the patients developed cholangitis after the procedure. Please correct 0.8 to 0.9 Table 1: Successful stenting of malign or benign strictures Complete the word malignant Preop rectal diclofenac administration Yes, should be 30% instead of 29.9% so that the total Yes + No = 100% Table 2 title should be changed as follow: Indications of ERCP in Participating Centers Table 3 Hyperamylasemia should be corrected to 4.7% change it in the table and in the body of manuscript. Cholangitis should be corrected to 0.9 please change in table 3 and in the manuscript. Stent migration should be 0.3 please change. Total complication should be corrected to 10.1



## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 104618

**Title:** Results of endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography procedures at surgical clinics: A multicenter observational study in Türkiye

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 08351041

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

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

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2024-12-31

**Reviewer chosen by:** Yu-Fei Wei

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2025-02-28 08:03

**Reviewer performed review:** 2025-02-28 13:35

**Review time:** 5 Hours

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

Is the content of the Introduction adequate? **No**

Is the content of the Materials and Methods complete?  
**No**

Is the description of the experiments clear and complete? **No**

Are the experimental data presented in the manuscript's biostatistics content reliable? **No**

Are the experimental data of the Results true and reliable? **No**

Are the quality and resolution of the images up to standard? **No**

Do the selection and design of the figures and tables follow the principles of necessity and clarity? **No**

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**

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

Is the content of the Discussion reasonable? **No**

Is the Conclusion reasonable? **No**

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

Do authors omit important references? **Yes**

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

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

Is the manuscript's text correct, concise, and clear? **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? **No**



Scientific quality	Grade D (Fair)
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 E (Do not publish)
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	Major revision
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: Anonymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Authors appear to have uploaded revised manuscripts in a sloppy and careless manner. The article cannot be evaluated in this form. Absolutely unprintable. I think that the authors have uploaded such a text by mistake. Some parts of the Word file are in Turkish and some parts are in English. This is unacceptable. Half of the article is written in Turkish or another language. Certainly not in English. Statistics were not performed. The aim of the study was stated to be descriptive. I ask them to share a descriptive study with me in this way. I will examine the article in question. Please edit more carefully and carefully. It is impossible for me to evaluate it as it is.