# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** Artificial Intelligence in Medical Imaging

**Manuscript NO:** 57205

**Title:** Acute Pancreatitis: A Pictorial Review of Early Pancreatic Fluid Collections

**Reviewer's code:** 02830107

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor, Chief Doctor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-05-28

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-05-28 18:59

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-05-28 19:54

**Review time:** 1 Hour

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[  ] Grade D: Fair    [  ] Grade E: Do not publish |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

**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

First of all, I would like to thank the author for drawing attention to an important issue still confused by our colleagues who could not update themselves in radiology practice. With the new update, the author has clarified the issue with appropriate figures by focusing on the problems that may arise about this topic in radiology practice. For this reason, the study is well-designed and the points and solutions that can lead to confusion are stated in the article at a sufficient level.