

July, 2014

Dear Editor,



Title: Hydatid cyst of the pancreas: Report of an undiagnosed case of pancreatic hydatid cyst and brief literature review

Author: Sami Akbulut, Ridvan Yavuz, Nilgun Sogutcu, Bulent Kaya, Sinan Hatipoglu, Ayhan Senol, Firat Demircan

Name of Journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

ESPS Manuscript NO: 11294

The manuscript has been improved according to the suggestions of reviewers:

1 Format has been updated

2 Revision has been made according to the suggestions of the reviewer

Reviewer comment (2721423): The topic of this review is relevant although if performed in a systematic way it would have delivered a stronger evidence-based article for the medical community. Without bringing any new findings, this review stands out over previous attempts as it properly describes the methodology behind the searching and selection process of retrieving articles and represents a comprehensive source of information of reported cases in the last 4.5 years. Specific comments: 1. About the Title ? It is not mentioned the inclusion of a case report. ? Title similar to other studies previously published (i.e. Masoodi et al. 2011) might be preferable to look for a more innovative combination of words. 2. Abstract ? No background provided ? Methods: not necessary to specify the keywords in the abstract but I would be more precised in which key information extracted from the articles was critical to be found in order to decide if the study was to be included or rejected. ? Results: The case report was not mentioned at all. 3. Introduction ? Special attention to the nomenclature in italic. ? Missing reference. 4. Materials and Methods ? Why not put a restriction of the documentation searched (i.e. just peer-reviewed articles) instead of including even the letters to the editors? ? Which info was critical to be found in the article in order to select the paper? (i.e. gender and age of the patient, cyst location, cyst size, type of treatment, etc.) ? Remove words with subjective connotations (i.e. ... and misfortune of a 48-year-old woman with pancreatic hydatid cyst who unfortunately died after follow-up in our clinic) 5. Results: ? Remove words with subjective connotations (i.e. Unfortunately, the profound coagulopathy that developed in the patient could not be reverted...) ? Advised some consistency in results reporting. For example, for each finding give the number of studies accompanied by the percentage, i.e. Twenty-eight (49.12%) patients were female and 29 were male (50.88%). 6. Discussion: ? Special attention to the nomenclature in italic. ? Mixing-up between the reporting of findings and the discussion section: Move to discussion section the findings on PHC isolated/secondary, patient symptoms, pre-surgery diagnosis or surgical approach. ? Missing reference ? Remove words with subjective connotations (i.e. Unfortunately, our

patient was lost to a misfortunate complication.) Some specific comments and suggested amendments are provided in the reviewed version of the manuscript.

Response: Thank you for your evaluation. The title have been rearranged according to your and other referees's suggestions. The abstract was rearranged according to the policies of BPG criteria for considering the original article, type. Our own case was added to abstract section. Material and methods section has been revised according to the your recommendations. On the other hand, manuscript was re-written by a native English speaker.

Reviewer comment (2925957): General comments may consist of four major points 1) the article is too long and it would be better if its minimized 2) several grammatical and typographic errors are there which needs thorough revision of the language specific comments may consist of the following points title: it should reflect that articles reviewed in the article are only of last 5 years abstract: 1) it should be highlighted that authors are presenting one case of their own and then they are also reviewing current literature 2) in the abstract, 14 patients are sero negative and in the main discussion, 15 patients are sero- negative. please write the correct number. results: 1) first the case report by the author should be written , after which the review of other literatures can be detailed. 2) in literature review, same country is mentioned twice eg, 15 from india and 20 from india. 8 from turkey and 10 from turkey. can be combined together or if not; mention in a different way with article reference. discussion: it is too long – please make it short.. tables and figures: tables are ok but figures are supposed to be better. it is preferable if pancreatic tissue also could be seen in the microscopy picture. Classification of the manuscript grade c Language evaluation grade b: minor language polishing;

Response: Thank you for your contribution. We have shorten the article as much as possible according to your recommendations . You were right about this study was too long. We wanted to provide information to its readers about the pancreatic hydatid cyst symptoms, complications and treatment approach. The article was re-written by a native English speaker and the title has been revised. Serological with data-related errors have been corrected.The result section has been revised according to your suggestion (ie. 15 articles published from india, 8 published articles from turkey, 20 cases and 10 cases from india from turkey). We apologize for any misunderstanding caused.

Reviewer comment (70191): 1. The title should be more noteworthy. 2. Selection of cases is not clear. What are the exact criteria for inclusion or exclusion of cases? 3. What is new in the case presented by the authors? 4. What is the differences or similarities between the previously reported cases described in the literature and the case presented by the authors? 5. Subjective connotations should be avoided. 6. The discussion and results are intermingled therefore should be separated. 7. Although primary hydatid disease of the pancreas is an extremely rare clinical condition, it must be included in the differential diagnosis of pancreatic tumors with cystic components, particularly in regions endemic for the disease. In the differential diagnosis those lesions should take into consideration such as pancreatic pseudocysts, serous and mucinous cystic tumors, solid pseudopapillary tumors, intraductal papillary mucinous tumors, and osteoclast-like giant cell

tumors. Therefore histopathological differential diagnosis should be clearly discussed. 8. Some references are missing 9. English needs some brushing up regarding to grammar and syntax

Response: Thank you for your contributions. The title was re-written. We were used to analyze a definitive date range for this literature review. Posted about pancreatic hydatid cyst in this date range and reached full text or summary of all articles were evaluated. E-mail was sent to all corresponding authors. I think that our case and study is the contribution to the literature. That is; a phenomenon that can not be diagnosed preoperatively to have wanted to address the drawbacks of the use of radical surgery. For example, if we could put the preoperative diagnosis of hydatid disease than a palliative surgical procedures were applied. In light of this report, we wanted to emphasize the importance of differential diagnosis.

Reviewer comment(2909238): Dear Authors, First of all sorry for my English, I am not a mother tongue and I suggest that if we are not english mother tongue we need, before submitting a paper, to have the paper corrected by a mother tongue person. I think that your paper deserve publication, but it need to be rewritten. I suppose that you have had the idea of writing this paper after having diagnosed your clinical case, so you need to start from your clinical case report and to state that it is important when a patient comes to your observation with such symptoms to consider pancreatic hydatid cyst in the differential diagnosis to avoid complication and in order to underline your findings you performed the review of the literature. So I think that you might modify the title in something like "Report of an undiagnosed case of PHC and brief review of the literature" and to reorganize the paper following this suggestion.

Response: Thank you for your contributions. The article was re-written by a native English speaker and the title has been revised.

3 References and typesetting were corrected

Thank you again for publishing our manuscript in the *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

Sincerely yours,

Sami Akbulut, MD, FICS, FACS
Department of Surgery,
Diyarbakir Education and Research Hospital,
21400, Diyarbakir, Turkey
Telephone: +90 412 2580075
Fax: +90 412 2580070
E-mail: akbulutsami@gmail.com