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Reviewer’s report:

This is an interesting manuscript evaluating the role of direct peroral cholangioscopy (DPOC) in detecting (and removing) residual common bile duct stones.

There are too many language and spelling errors. Please check and correct.

I think that it is not correct to use the term of "lithotomy" for the stone removal done during ERCP procedure. Because the meanings of lithotomy are: 1-surgical incision of the urinary bladder for removal of a stone, 2-surgical removal of a calculus (stone) from the bladder, kidney, or urinary tract, 3- surgery to remove one or more stones from an organ or duct. ERCP is not a surgical procedure.

To avoid confusion, do not use different names for the same tool. Example; endoscope, ultrathin endoscope, gastroscope, gastroendoscope … names were used for the tool used for doing DPOC.

I think that the exclusion criteria "a common bile duct diameter of<10mm" was not appropriate. If the diameter of bile duct was not return to normal or near normal after extraction of stones, I think that there is some stones left. And continue to check the bile duct with basket and/or balloon.

The general characteristics of the patients included in the study should be given as a table in a comparative manner with the excluded group.

They stated that they excluded patients with gallbladder stones from the study. However, 17 patients later had cholecystectomy. What is the indication of cholecystectomy?

Endoscopic papillary balloon dilatation was done to the most of the patients. Why?

The time between ERCP and DPOC is not clear. This information should be given in detail.

At discussion section they wrote that "the residual stone rate by DPOC was similar to patients with cholecystolithiasis". There is no information about this in the study.

"In the present study, a nearly 95% success rate was obtained using the direct insertion method or ordinary guidewire, and the operation was simple and the time was short." There is a mistake in this sentence. Because they used overtube in %10 of patients.
When I see a cholangiogram similar to the one presented at figure 3d, I think that there are remained stones within the bile duct. And continue ERCP.

The quality of video was very poor.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

**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.

No

**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:

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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