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**Reviewer's report:**

This is an excellent review evaluating the safety of ERCP in the elderly population.

A few comments:

1. The authors list the total number of complications between the two groups, but it would be interesting to know if certain complications were higher in the elderly group such as bleeding (given a higher percentage are likely on anti-coagulation), aspiration, cardiac abnormalities. Also, it would be helpful to know the breakdown of what complications occurred.

2. The authors list 27 failures - 22 failed cannulation, 2 bradycardia, 1 perforation. What were the other 2?

3. The authors state all patients were done under moderate sedation - did no patients require general anesthesia? Were patients who needed general anesthesia excluded?

4. None of the patients in this series had malignant obstruction as the indication for ERCP -- were patients with cancer excluded? It seems to me that a high percentage of older patients requiring ERCP are due to malignancy and it would be useful to know if the safety profile is as good in those patients since they tend to be longer and more complex ERCPs.

5. Why did fewer patients in the elderly group have sphincterotomy? Is this because a higher percentage were on anti-coagulation? Could that be a factor in the lack of difference in complication rates between the groups?

6. This discussion is a bit long - I think it could be condensed a bit.
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