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Reviewer's report:

Important study

Minor points
In introduction, it has been shown that the rate of post-ERCP pancreatitis may be as high as 15.1%, which includes 1% of patients graded as severe in degree.[9] (THIS IS IN HIGH RISK PATIENTS WITH SUSPECTED SPHINCTER OF ODDI DYSFUNCTION, NOT BILE DUCT STONES. SHOULD ADD STATEMENT TO THAT EFFECT)

Moreover, the diagnostic rate is dramatically reduced for smaller CBD stones (#5 mm). [13] PLEASE STATE THE RATE.

In Methods section, need to state "GOLD STANDARD" for TRUTH STANDARD for definition of bile duct stone. What was considered true positive, true negative, false positive and false negative? Was ERCP truth standard? If so what?

Need to calculate positive and negative predictive values in addition to sensitivity and specificity

Is this appropriate? Stones seen at EUS can easily be missed by cholangiography and even balloon extraction.

Otherwise worthwhile paper.
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