



**ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 24905

**Title:** Is Endoscopic Papillary Balloon Dilatation (EPBD) Really a Risk Factor for Post-ERCP Pancreatitis?

**Reviewer’s code:** 00052899

**Reviewer’s country:** China

**Science editor:** Yuan Qi

**Date sent for review:** 2016-02-14 10:23

**Date reviewed:** 2016-02-28 18:41

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google 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"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

**COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

There’s a lot of debate about whether EPBD could be used for the prevention from early complications of ERCP. The safety of EPBD has been widely questioned because of a high incidence of PEP. Thus, how to improve the safety and efficacy of EPBD becomes particularly important. In this review, the authors compared EPBD with EST in 13 randomised control trials, and direct EPLBD with EST in 10 studies, separately. They found that the incidence of PEP in EPBD was higher than that in EST in 3 RCT. But longer and higher-pressure inflation of balloons might decrease the incidence of PEP. This review investigated an interesting medical problem. Overall, the article has been selected carefully. However, there are still some defects. First, in the authors’ opinion, EPBD could decrease the early complications of ERCP, including bleeding, biliary infection and perforation. But, the effects on the incidence of biliary infection and perforation are not consistent. Second, EPBD with small-calibre balloons increases the incidence of PEP while EPLBD does not. The possible mechanisms of the paradoxical results should be discussed more. The authors speculated the reason is insufficient papillary dilatation. Is there any other probable reason?



**ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 24905

**Title:** Is Endoscopic Papillary Balloon Dilatation (EPBD) Really a Risk Factor for Post-ERCP Pancreatitis?

**Reviewer's code:** 00052926

**Reviewer's country:** Greece

**Science editor:** Yuan Qi

**Date sent for review:** 2016-02-14 10:23

**Date reviewed:** 2016-03-07 03:26

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> The same title	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

**COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

The paper by Fujisawa et al on technical aspects of endoscopic papillary balloon dilatation (EPBD) and its pros and cons, is a well written, analysed and detailed review. The authors convince us that EPBP is an effective method to remove bile stones without sphincterotomy. The authors suggest that if the papilla is dilated sufficiently (ballooning size > stone size, at least 8 mm with sufficient pressure for opening the waist; and ballooning time > 60 seconds) and a prophylactic pancreatic stent is placed, the post ERP pancreatitis is prevented and other complications of ERCP are decreasing. I have some minor comments Page 8 "A total of 13 RCTs was included in the analysis". References of 13 RCT are needed Page 9 "3 RCT", "3 RCT" etc References of 3 RCT are needed Page 9 "There was no obvious difference in EPBD procedures between the significant group and the non-significant group" Please define the significant and the non significant groups. Page 14 "Among the 10 EPLBD studies in Table 3, six and four studies used the stone size and waist disappearance approaches, respectively" Which studies?



# 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 Gastroenterology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 24905

**Title:** Is Endoscopic Papillary Balloon Dilatation (EPBD) Really a Risk Factor for Post-ERCP Pancreatitis?

**Reviewer's code:** 00055095

**Reviewer's country:** Hungary

**Science editor:** Yuan Qi

**Date sent for review:** 2016-02-14 10:23

**Date reviewed:** 2016-03-08 03:17

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

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Review of the ms "Is Endoscopic Papillary Balloon Dilatation (EPBD) Really a Risk Factor for Post-ERCP Pancreatitis?" by Toshio Fujisawa et al. The aims of this review paper were to summarize the literature data on the efficacy of endoscopic papillary balloon dilatation / endoscopic papillary large balloon dilatation, and to re-evaluate the incidence of post-ERCP pancreatitis following EPBD. The manuscript presents a well-stated hypothesis and its clear debate: the authors suggest that balloon dilatation itself does not cause PEP, but the procedures accompanying insufficient dilatation of the papilla can indeed induce PEP. In this respect the work is timely and reasonably discussed, I found that it read quite well, was well organized/presented and well cited.