Baishideng Publishing Group

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Radiology*

Manuscript NO: 80451

Title: Imaging of paraduodenal pancreatitis: A systematic review

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 00068668

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: FASGE, MD, MSc, PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor, Doctor, Staff Physician

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2022-09-28

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-09-29 21:13

Reviewer performed review: 2022-10-10 04:41

Review time: 10 Days and 7 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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) [ ] 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

The present study is an interesting systematic review about the image characteristics in patients with Groove pancreatitis. The topic is interesting and the existing data are scarce, so I consider can be published. In general is a good study that can be helpful for clinicians. However two main concerns arise: Evaluation of bias of the included studies was not showed and is imperative   The limitations and strengths of the study must be mentioned.

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [Y] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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) [ ] 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

This is a clinically important a systematic Review investigating imaging of paraduodenal pancreatitis (PP). However, there are several issues in this paper that need to be reconsidered. Major 1. Distinguishing between PP and pancreatic cancer remains challenging in clinical setting. Thus, the features of PP should be contrasted with those of pancreatic cancer. The authors focus on four articles explored imaging accuracy in differential diagnosis between PP and pancreatic cancer. However, this systematic review only enumerated those results and did not provide a cross-cutting interpretation. Please assess which imaging should be used in the differential diagnosis of PP and pancreatic cancer. 2. The author states in the Introduction section that PP has been subdivided into cystic or solid type; however, there was no mention of cystic and solid types in the results section. Please consider dividing PP into cystic type and solid type.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Radiology*

Manuscript NO: 80451

Title: Imaging of paraduodenal pancreatitis: A systematic review

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 00068668

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: FASGE, MD, MSc, PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor, Doctor, Staff Physician

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2022-09-28

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-10-25 03:39

Reviewer performed review: 2022-10-25 03:49

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [Y] 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) [ ] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. The "statistical analysis" section is incomplete. For example, there is not even mentioned how   was the assessment of heterogeneity 2. In the text are mentioned few tables that I cannot see in any place   3. The evaluation of bias is only mentioned but I do not see