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(A) This is a retrospective study cohort with ERCP in 1148 patients. 51 patients out of post-EST 573 developed recurrent CBD stones in them.

1. Dilated CBD more than 12 mm, 2. Stricture of major papillaost-ES to 2-5 mm 3. presence of the ampulla within or on the edge of a duodenal diverticulum

   ➔ How about the type of JPD categorization and size measuring you adopt? (J Gastroenterol Hepatol, 2013. 28(5): p. 893-8 ) and number (or %) of patient cirrhosis (T.-J. Tsai et al. / Journal of the Chinese Medical Association 75 (2012) ) and method of stones extraction; such as basket, balloon or mechanical basket?

(B) The time to recurrence ranged from 6 months to 15 years (mean 3.3 years). Do you had the above analysis and distribution curve in incidence (shown as Figure 2)?

(C) Does the number of ERCP performed in single patient relate to the CBD stones recurrence early or more frequent?

(D) Do you had a new findings or comparison in long-term outcome between Tsujino,T et al. and the reported your study (ERCP+balloon vs ERCP+ES)?

(E) What is your explanation or hypothesis in the more dilated CBD size the more easy CBD stones recurrence?

   ---Dyskinesia and/or delay biliary transit?

   ---Incompetency of ampulla of Vater?

(F) Do you have an analysis of clinical difference in the patients group early recurrent CBDs within one year and delay CBDs recurrence more than 10 years?
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
Acceptable
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