Iranian Journal of Radiology
Volume 18 · Issue 3 · e114097

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Radiation-Free Transabdominal Ultrasound-Guided Endoscopic Biliary Stenting in Pregnant Women with Choledocholithiasis

Mohammed Mahmoud Abdo, Mohammad Ahmad Al-Shatouri

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
26 Feb 2021	7 Jul 2021	2 Aug 2021	10.5812/iranjradiol.114097

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 **Original submission** Referee 1, Mohammad Reza Babaei, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 2
2 **Revision 1** Editor-in-Chief 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 6

1 Original submission

4 comments · 10 Mar 2021 – 6 Jun 2021

Referee 1 Reviewer

ACCEPT 10 Mar 2021

From a methodological point of view, this is a descriptive study with a case series design, which is well written and approved.

Mohammad Reza Babaei Reviewer

ACCEPT 15 Mar 2021

Hi
Excellent and fantastic.

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 5 Apr 2021

Dear Authors:
I would like to thank you very much for submitting your manuscript for consideration by the Iranian Journal of Radiology and wish you every success. Your manuscript is accepted.
Best regards

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 6 Jun 2021

Dear authors,
Your article needs Minor Revision.
Regards

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Dear Editor,

Thank you for considering our manuscript 114097 for publication and sending these comments. We have promptly responded to the comments and corrected the manuscript as follows:

Reviewer 1: *From a methodological point of view, this is a descriptive study with case series design, which is well written and approved.*
Thank you for your comment.

Reviewer 2:
Hi
Excellent and fantastic.

Thank you for your comment.

Reviewer 3:
Please full mention of the abbreviation words used in table 1 at the bottom of table.
The abbreviations were added at the bottom of the table, thank you.

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:
Dear Authors:
I would like to thank you very much for submitting your manuscript for consideration in Iranian journal of radiology and wish you every success.
Your manuscript is accepted.
Best regards
Thank you very much for your comments.

Associate Editor 2:
114097
1-this sentence: “Many authors have described their experiences of managing choledecholithiasis without fluoroscopy using aspiration of bile as a guide for deep biliary cannulation [9]”
could be written as: “Many authors have described their experiences of managing choledecholithiasis without fluoroscopy by aspiration of bile using US as a guide for deep biliary cannulation [9]”
if I am right, please correct.
We have changed the sentence as it was not clear as you kindly stated. The changes were highlighted in the revised manuscript. Actually some endoscopists use no any image guidance during stent placement for pregnant patients. They just directly cannulate the papilla and try to aspirate by the endoscope after they push the endoscope gently. When bile is aspirated by the endoscope, they consider that the endoscope tip reached the CBD. The drawback of this procedure is that sometimes the tip of the endoscope is in the cystic duct and not in the CBD (in patients with low insertion of the cystic duct). In this case they may wrongly insert the stent in the cystic duct rather than in the CBD.
2-please change the method title to patients and methods.

The title was corrected. Thank you.
3-what is the meaning of radical in biliary radical dilation?
The term is confusing and was removed from the manuscript. Actually it means intrahepatic biliary branches.
4-this sentence is incomplete: “Fetal complications were assessed at and 1 month after delivery.” [at when?]
Thank you; the sentence was corrected and highlighted in the manuscript. The assessment was done before hospital discharge, at delivery and 1 month after delivery.
5-did the patients underwent ERCP? The authors mentioned “This study included 10 pregnant females who underwent ERCP during the period between January 2018 to October 2020.” |
Is this classic ERCP with fluoroscopy? please clarify.
Thank you for your comment. Actually it was not ERCP, it was endoscopic biliary stenting under US guidance. We have corrected this mistake (highlighted in yellow).
6-please delete mean in (mean 12) for gestational age in table 1. [and for CBD caliberf]
We have deleted the word (mean) as it was a mistake to write it. Thank you.
7-Please add full term of abbreviations as footnote in tables.
We have added the abbreviations as footnote in the tables. Thank you.

2 Revision 1

1 comment · 2 Aug 2021

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 2 Aug 2021

Dear authors,
Your article is acceptable for publication in IJR.
Regards