PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

Manuscript NO: 49275

Title: Validation and head-to-head comparison of four models for predicting malignancy in intraductal papillary mucinous neoplasm of the pancreas: a study based on endoscopic ultrasound findings

Reviewer's code: 00050853

Reviewer's country: Lebanon

Science editor: Ying Dou

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-06-14 04:47

Reviewer performed review: 2019-06-15 07:49

Review time: 1 Day and 3 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	[ ] Accept (High priority)	Peer-Review:
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] Accept (General priority)	[Y] Anonymous
[Y] Grade C: Good			[ ] Onymous
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Minor revision	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
[ ] Grade E: Do not publish	[ ] Grade D: Rejection	[Y] Major revision	[ ] Advanced
		[ ] Rejection	[Y] General
			[ ] No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			[ ] Yes
			[Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors conducted a study in which they performed a head to head comparison of several models used to predict pancreatic cancer in patients with IPMN. The study is

based on surgically resected specimens and therefore the diagnosis of benign and malignant lesions is well documented. The authors conclude that the PSC model is the best in predicting malignancy. The study is well done and the manuscript is well written. However, the implications of the study for gastroenterologists dealing with IPMN are not obvious. The authors need to present an algorithm for working up a patient with IPMN and for taking a decision to operate or not to operate based on their findings. They also need to clarify how their algorithm is similar or different from current guidelines of practice in patients with IPMN.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

BPG Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

Manuscript NO: 49275

Title: Validation and head-to-head comparison of four models for predicting malignancy in intraductal papillary mucinous neoplasm of the pancreas: a study based on endoscopic ultrasound findings

Reviewer's code: 03731607

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Ying Dou

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-05-25 13:15

Reviewer performed review: 2019-06-19 18:01

Review time: 25 Days and 4 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	[ ] Accept (High priority)	Peer-Review:
[Y] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[Y] Accept (General priority)	[Y] Anonymous
[ ] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Minor revision	[ ] Onymous
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejection	[ ] Major revision	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
[ ] Grade E: Do not publish		[ ] Rejection	[ ] Advanced
			[Y] General
			[ ] No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			[ ] Yes
			[Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors submit an external validation and comparison of four models for predicting malignant potential of IPMN using their single institution prospective database of 181

patients with IPMN who underwent resection. Overall the manuscript is well written and informative. I have the following constructive feedback 1) the title is informative and reflects the work 2) Abstract- well written 3) Introduction- good review of current data and explanation of the question and how it will impact practice. I would recommend the author strengthen the introduction by highlighting that nomograms lead to individual risk stratification and individualized/personalized medicine. This is in contrast to guidelines where all patients are treated uniformly. 4) Methods are sound and well described 5) Figures/tables- Figure 1 flow chart is informative. Figure 2 is not necessary since morphologic classification of mural nodules was not significant on univariate, multivariate analysis nor used in any of the nomograms. Figure 3- the forest plot is a nice representation of the OR for each factor. Figure 4 is the most important figure with the receiver operator curves. Figure 6- I honestly have not seen this kind of figure before but it was a helpful display of the data but perhaps should be switched to supplementary figures. Supplementary Figure 1- why didn't the authors compare their nomogram to the other four nomograms? The authors should report the sensitivity, specificity, NPV, PPV and accuracy of their nomogram. Table 1 is critical to report the characteristics of the population studied as that may influence the results. Table 2 is also important as the authors do not report the sensitivity or specificity in the manuscript so this figure is the only place to find it. I would suggest an additional table that includes all the factors for each of the four models the authors are comparing. This might be helpful for readers who are not as familiar with all 4 models. This could be a supplementary figure. 6) Discussion- The authors did a great job putting results in context and discussing implications of overestimation and underestimation. The biases and limitations of the study were discussed, however missing data is another bias that should be discussed in the limitations and transparency of how the authors dealt with missing data in the methods would be beneficial.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

BPG Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No