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Reviewer's report:

General
The article describes in a convincing way methods important for the daily interventional practice. The techniques are nicely described and the results are convincing and valuable. I think the article is suitable for publication.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

Minor Compulsory Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
In "Background":
2nd Paragraph: change "CPRM" with "MRCP"
6th Paragraph: correct "cholecystostomies"
7th Paragraph: correct "calculous"
last Paragraph: change "discriminating" to "differenciating"
In "Methods":
3rd Paragraph before the end: change "computations" with "calculations"
last sentence: change "SPPS" with "SPSS"
In "Conclusion":
1st Paragraph: The sentence "The patients with biliary obstruction needing for a biliary drainage often..."
needs to be changed to "Patients with obstructive jaundice, who are candidates for biliary drainage, often..."
In "Tables": Table 1 should be named.
In "References": In Ref., the Numbers 27-34 are written twice.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
In "Methods":
4th and 5th Paragraph: There are 78 patients analyzed in Methods (18+50+2+8), but the authors mention initially 80 patients in total.
In "Results": Results and Discussion are written together. If not Ok from your Journal instructions, I propose starting a new capital "Discussion" with the already existing paragraph: "The evaluation of patients......... ". So, according to that change:
In "Results":
1st Paragraph: How did the pathologist differentiate between "primary" and "metastatic" adenocarcinomas?
In "Discussion":
2nd Paragraph: In the sentence: "As a final diagnosis could radically affect further therapeutic choices histological,
an histological characterization....." the first "histological" is probably obsolete.
Somewhere in "Results", the authors mention transient hemobilia in 5 patients as 10.6%,
while in "Discussion" they mention 8.7%. Which one is true?
Also, somewhere in "Results", the authors mention endoluminal forceps results accuracy as 93.6%,
while in "Discussion" they mention 93.5%. Which one is true?

Advice on publication: Accept after minor compulsory revisions

Level of interest: A paper of considerable merit and interest in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published
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