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Reviewer's report:
1. This study is a retrospective analysis of patients who underwent ERCP and ES on a prospectively maintained database for 15 years. The follow-up of this study was so long that the long-term complication rate could be considered as a representative measure.
2. Is there any standardization of ES incision length in this study? Is full cut or half cut of ampulla of Vater?
3. Do you have checked the status of stricture in CBD as well as the refusion in papillary orifice s/p EST? Because of anatomical variance would result in different recurrence of CBD stone
4. Does the more increase the diameter of the CBD, it more increases the first, the second…recurrences of CBDs at the clinical presentation in your study?
5. How much percentage of CBDs retrieval by simple basket? Balloon method? And Mechanical basket equipment? Does the latter will more complicate with CBDs recurrence?
6. In this study, does the CBD diameter related to age, time (early or late) in CBDs recurrence? Moreover, does it related to ES complications such as: bleeding, cholangitis, pancreatitis….
7. Do you compare with CBD diameter in group of CBDs with/without recurrence?
8. Does this study observe the regression of CBD diameter after stones extraction, it seems to less stone recurrence (no biliary dyskinesia) in your clinical follow-up.

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.
I recommend additional statistical review

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