Baishideng Publishing Group

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 80034

Title: Imaging diagnostic value of autoimmune pancreatitis

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05225141

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: DVM, PhD

Professional title: N/A

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-09-15

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-09-15 13:23

Reviewer performed review: 2022-09-18 00:50

Review time: 2 Days and 11 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous

statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this letter, the authors discussed the timely and correct diagnosis of autoimmune pancreatitis (AIP) is essential for the prognosis of steroid hormone therapy. It provides opinions about the cases of the reviewed paper. Overall, this letter emphasizes some aspects of AIP diagnosis and hormone therapy. Some revisions are needed. the appropriated treatment > the appropriate treatment. became remission in the disease courses > became remission during the disease courses. lymphoplasmatic cell > lymphoplasmacytic cell. serum IgG4 level > levels. Abbreviations, such as CT (full name); immunoglobulin 4 (IgG4) should be listed at the first time shown in the manuscript. including: remove (:).

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous

statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors of this letter provide significant aspects on the diagnosis of autoimmune pancreatitis (AIP). The primary theme of this letter emphasizes a few points about AIP diagnosis and hormone therapy. They have made comment on the interesting case report of Zhang et al. The authors have concluded that, 1) AIP patients must be followed up through imaging and laboratory examinations for a long time to evaluate possible late complications. 2) Early diagnosis and timely treatment with steroid drugs should be advocated. One suggestion can be made: 1. The authors may include figures of scan images (may be CT or some other) used for the AIP diagnosis for better understanding by the readers.

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [Y] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous

| statements | Conflicts-of-Interest: [   ] Yes   [Y] No |

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Abstract: It is too long for a letter to editor. It should briefly summarize the case report and emphasize the additional points of the letter to the editor.   Core tip: What the letter adds to the published case report and its offerings, this part must state this.   Rest of the letter: The letter mostly repeats the facts of the case report. However it is exppected to contain new and or additional information.Which parts is additional and which part is successfully stated by the previous case report is difficult to understand. The letter should be entirely reorganized.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Reviewer performed review: 2022-10-08 12:28

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I generally liked the latest form. However the core tip needs still a summarising.