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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
Dear Editor, Although the article is correctly written and clearly presented, the objective is not clear to me. Indeed, ERCP is a specific therapeutic procedure for which there are clear indications and clear contraindications. If a patient needs ERCP (choledocholithiasis or biliary stricture), there is no adequate, less invasive method that would provide equally good results. Therefore, the decision to perform ERCP or not does not depend on the patient's performance status, but on whether there is an indication for ERCP. Of course, patients who are older and have comorbidities are more likely to have a worse outcome no matter which method we use. Therefore, I think the paper does not add to the knowledge in this area.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
For a more detailed analysis, please see attached file WJG ERCP CBDS PS3. First: This study contributes data to just a few extant data points about safety and efficacy of ERCP for CBDS in some of the "sickest" patients that can be seen. This is all the more important as the number of this subpopulation grows with the aging worldwide population. Second: Study was well designed and executed. Third: Study was completed only in East Asian populations in experienced centers. The results may not prove replicable for non academic centers in Central America, for example. More data is needed worldwide in areas with different levels of expertise and approach (for instance, greater use of General Anesthesia and MAC in the US for ERCP).