



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 Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 27565

Title: Post Endoscopic Retrograde Cholangiopancreatography Pancreatitis: Risk Factors and Predictors of Severity

Reviewer's code: 03000523

Reviewer's country: Croatia

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2016-06-06 11:40

Date reviewed: 2016-06-15 01:47

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 type="checkbox"/> 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input 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

I have read manuscript, and I must admit that number of 996 participant is significant number. But what bothers me is that there were not one in hospital death on this number of patients evendo reported number of pancreatitis is 102, of that severe in 22 patients? Furthermore, this study doesn't offer not single scientific novelty: so far it has been researched and published in many articles that younger age, smaller CBD diameter and number of pancreatic cannulations are risk factors for post-ERCP pancreatitis development. I don't think that this study offers new knowledges and my recommendation is not to publish.



ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 27565

Title: Post Endoscopic Retrograde Cholangiopancreatography Pancreatitis: Risk Factors and Predictors of Severity

Reviewer’s code: 03316921

Reviewer’s country: Mexico

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2016-06-06 11:40

Date reviewed: 2016-06-17 21:35

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 checked="" 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 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 checked="" 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

Comments for Authors: General observations: We have to say that your manuscript and study are well structured. You have an important number of patients and your aim stays on focus. However we have some observations: First, you have to do a good review and correct all orthographic errors like “edema” instead of “oedema” or “sphincterotomy” instead of “sphinctertomy”. CBD definition is not mentioned at any time. Abstract: You have to mention the definition of CBD. Introduction: Please mention which are the main indications for ERCP. Also it would be better if you gave information about the factors or preventive measures for PEP in this section and not only giving a reference on your discussion. Methods: If your do not have any specific requirement for your inclusion criteria, you have to specify it anyway. Do you use any preventive measures like NSAIDs in your patients in order to decrease the risk of PEP? This can change your results in a very important way, so if you don’t use any, please specify it in order to avoid confusion. Discussion: In your sentence: “These ratios are concordant with data reported by previous studies [14-16]” it would be better to describe the results of the other studies to have a better comparison between results. Why



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>

do you use a cutoff value at age 35? Specify it and also when talking about the results of other studies related, mention the results. In your sentence “ This is supported by the finding that precut sphincterotomy was not reported as a risk factor for PEP from endoscopists who adopted precut sphincterotomy as a preferred technique from the start not just a salvage procedure after difficult cannulation through conventional cannulation methods” you talk about the sphinctertomy as a possible risk to PEP, but it would be better also to mention in your results section if any of your patients have sphincterotomy done and how many patients were. Tables: Correct errors like “canulation” instead of cannulation on table 3. We will gladly review the manuscript once the changes are made.



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 Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 27565

Title: Post Endoscopic Retrograde Cholangiopancreatography Pancreatitis: Risk Factors and Predictors of Severity

Reviewer's code: 03529651

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2016-06-06 11:40

Date reviewed: 2016-06-19 10:53

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 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 checked="" 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

This is a unique study with a significant number of patients treating an important topic, focusing on detection of risk factors for PEP and investigate the predictors of its severity in a tertiary high volume referral surgical center in Egypt. The results have a clinical impact on defining patients at the highest risk for PEP. This is a well-written article; the manuscript is concise, clear, comprehensive, and convincing. However, I am concerned about four points described below. - They need to clarify the number of patients and method of diagnosis of suspected sphincter of Oddi dysfunction in this study and its impact on PEP incidence. - A history of previous PEP was another clinical risk factor for post-ERCP pancreatitis in some previous studies, does this apply to any of the studied patients?. - In patients with suspected choledocholithiasis, does the absence of common bile duct stones was a risk factor for PEP?. - They do not mention if a pancreatic duct stent was placed after the ERCP to minimize post ERCP pancreatitis.



ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 27565

Title: Post Endoscopic Retrograde Cholangiopancreatography Pancreatitis: Risk Factors and Predictors of Severity

Reviewer's code: 02997840

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2016-06-06 11:40

Date reviewed: 2016-06-19 22:10

Table with 4 columns: CLASSIFICATION, LANGUAGE EVALUATION, SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT, CONCLUSION. It contains checkboxes for various review criteria like 'Grade A: Excellent', 'Priority publishing', 'Google Search', etc.

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript by El Nakeeb and colleagues addresses the ongoing problem with post-ERCP pancreatitis. The authors reviewed their institutions experience. They found that 10.2% of patients developed PEP. The risk factors for PEP were a younger age, narrower CBD diameter, and the number of pancreatic cannulations. The strengths of this study include its prospective design, large number of patients, and appropriate statistical analyses. The weaknesses and concerns include: 1. The authors need to clearly express how this manuscript adds to our understanding of PEP. What did they find that will advance the field? 2. The authors need to provide support for their method of defining PEP severity. The method requires a citation if it has been used by previous investigators. The "need for intervention" needs to be clarified. Which interventions are included here? 3. The authors do not comment on whether they used any pretreatment to prevent PEP in any of their patients. 4. The manuscript requires editing for English usage.



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 Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 27565

Title: Post Endoscopic Retrograde Cholangiopancreatography Pancreatitis: Risk Factors and Predictors of Severity

Reviewer's code: 02904481

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2016-06-06 11:40

Date reviewed: 2016-06-20 03:37

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 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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

This is a large-sample study focusing on risks factors of PEP and predictors of its severity, with high reliability. There are some problems in the manuscript as follows: 1. With or without any routine prophylaxis of PEP in the study? 2. There is a mistake in Table 2, on the line of indication of ERCP and the column of severity of pancreatitis. 3. Regarding severity of pancreatitis, relevant discussion is needed.



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 Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 27565

Title: Post Endoscopic Retrograde Cholangiopancreatography Pancreatitis: Risk Factors and Predictors of Severity

Reviewer's code: 03476646

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2016-06-06 11:40

Date reviewed: 2016-06-26 00:34

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"/> 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 checked="" 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

In this manuscript the authors clarified the risk factors for post-ERCP pancreatitis and the predictors of its severity. And this study may have influence on many endoscopists. However, this manuscript as presented needs some clarifications and revises.