



### PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Manuscript NO:** 59850

**Title:** Solid pseudopapillary neoplasm: diagnostic approach and post-surgical follow up based on three case reports and review of literature

**Reviewer's code:** 03476917

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** India

**Author's Country/Territory:** United States

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-10-07

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-10-07 15:19

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-10-08 04:41

**Review time:** 13 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](http://www.wjgnet.com)

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

The report on three different cases have been summarised well. As this is a very rare neoplasm, the usual line of management that have been followed has been elucidated in the three cases. Also, No definite new line of management could be considered, which would be a limitation. Since one of the patients had a large tumor, the follow up information on any recurrence may be considered; but it would obviously delay your time to publish. Correction as follows, in the line 195 - size) and "surgery" at 3 and 9 months after surgery. She had a full recovery 4 months after surgery without -- the word surgery appears to be repeated



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Manuscript NO:** 59850

**Title:** Solid pseudopapillary neoplasm: diagnostic approach and post-surgical follow up based on three case reports and review of literature

**Reviewer’s code:** 03477516

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer’s Country/Territory:** Japan

**Author’s Country/Territory:** United States

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-10-07

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-10-07 21:54

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-10-18 07:36

**Review time:** 10 Days and 9 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Thank you for the opportunity to review this paper. This revised manuscript was “Solid pseudopapillary neoplasm: diagnostic approach and post-surgical follow up based on three case reports and review of literature”. This manuscript was case report of SPN with review of literature. But this manuscript is well described , but insufficiently described at some points, I wonder you should consider several important points of it.

1, In case presentation, how did the selection of operative methods in your institute do? SPN was low malignant disease, but about 10% patients were occurred to metastasis. Lymph node dissection of your cases were underwent? You should reveal your manuscript. 2, In our country, EUS-FNA for cystic neoplasms was contraindications. Because sometimes the patients had some complications as dissemination, perforation, and so on. You should describe and discuss for these points in discussion. Minor) In case presentation, why did you divide Final diagnosis, treatment, outcome apart from each case? Please consider these points.



### PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Manuscript NO:** 59850

**Title:** Solid pseudopapillary neoplasm: diagnostic approach and post-surgical follow up based on three case reports and review of literature

**Reviewer's code:** 05212237

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** China

**Author's Country/Territory:** United States

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-10-07

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-10-13 14:04

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-11-02 05:33

**Review time:** 19 Days and 15 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA

**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568

**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)

**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](http://www.wjgnet.com)

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

1. Many larger series of SPN have been reported. 2. In this report, 67% of post-surgical complications is too high. Nowadays, the pancreatectomy with the preservation of organ function has been applied in many centers for SPN, It has many advantages, and the pancreaticoduodenectomy has a high complication rate, which is not conducive to the preservation of organ function.