

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 68664

**Title:** Solid pseudopapillary neoplasm of the pancreas in a young male with main pancreatic duct dilatation: A case report

**Reviewer's code:** 04172689

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MBChB, MSc

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** United Kingdom

**Author's Country/Territory:** Japan

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-08-21

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-08-21 17:26

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-08-28 13:58

**Review time:** 6 Days and 20 Hours

|                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| <b>Scientific quality</b>       | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good<br><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 Grade E: Do not publish            |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<br><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)<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection             |
| <b>Re-review</b>                | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No   |
| <b>Peer-reviewer statements</b> | Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous<br>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>

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

This is a good article discussing the occurrence of solid pseudopapillary neoplasm of the pancreas in a young male patient with MPD dilatation. Line 41 ..... pancreatic duct dilatation can occur in SPN regardless of malignancy ..... Could the authors please clarify what this statement means? It does appear the authors are implying that some SPNs are not malignant, and I notice this is a recurring theme in the paper. Rarely, SPNs of the pancreas may show infiltration of adjacent structures, lymphovascular invasion, perineural invasion or even distant metastases years after the resection of the primary tumour. As a result, WHO currently classifies all SPNs as low-grade malignant neoplasms. Line 156 ....the highest level of differentiation is .... Can the authors clarify what they mean by this statement?

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 68664

**Title:** Solid pseudopapillary neoplasm of the pancreas in a young male with main pancreatic duct dilatation: A case report

**Reviewer's code:** 05332400

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

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

**Author's Country/Territory:** Japan

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-08-21

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-08-23 14:04

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-08-30 04:08

**Review time:** 6 Days and 14 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<br><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<br><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)<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection             |
| <b>Re-review</b>                | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No   |
| <b>Peer-reviewer statements</b> | Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous<br>Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No   |

## **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

This is a educational case report of solid pseudopapillary neoplasm of pancreas (SPN). The authors had better concern about the following points. Major 1) This case report differs from typical patient in terms of sex, location and pancreatic duct dilatation. However, As you mention, there are numerous case reports about SPN with pancreatic duct dilation. Please emphasize the novelty of this case a little more. 2) The authors initially suspected pancreatic cancer and performed EUS-FNA, but it is not uncommon for the result to be a different diagnosis. Your hypothesis that tumor growth speed causes pancreatic duct dilation is very interesting, though it remains a matter of speculation. The author should describe these discussion more logically using literatures. Minor 1. Main text (1) Did chief complaint about epigastric pain improve after surgery? Was the chief complaint related to the SPN? (2) I think a term on the 4th page is a misspelling. "physical examinati" → "physical examination" (3) Please show that how many millimeters the pancreatic duct was dilated. (4) It was probable that the author assumed pancreatic cancer, but did you consider pancreatic juice cytology by ERP? 2. Table 1 Laboratory data (1) It is not appropriate to describe in Japanese as a unit. Red blood cells  $4.62 \times 100$  万/ $\mu\text{l}$  3. Figure Overall, these figures are difficult to understand and fail to provide important information. There are no figure legends. The author did not mention which figure is which immunostaining. Please add on image scale.