PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Translational Medicine*

Manuscript NO: 85351

Title: Duodenal Neuroendocrine tumor – Tertiary Care Centre Experience

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05465429

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor, Staff Physician

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: India

Manuscript submission date: 2023-04-23

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-05-16 09:13

Reviewer performed review: 2023-05-19 21:28

Review time: 3 Days and 12 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No scientific significance
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 statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Editor, Dear Author,   I read with interest the manuscript entitled "Duodenal Neuroendocrine tumor – Tertiary Care Centre Experience" by M Uma Devi et al. This was a case series reporting on the management of 5 cases of duodenal NETs, four of which treated by means of EMR.   I have the following comments: -Major 1. BPG guidelines for case reports writing (i.e. format) has not been followed. Please modify.   2. Numbers of tables and figures should be provided. -Minor 1. ABSTRACT: "Recently the incidence of NETs has increased due to advancements in diagnostic modalities and longer duration of survival."   the term incidence should be modified with diagnosis; incidence may be added prior to longer duration of survival. 2. TABLE 2010 WHO CLASSIFICATION OF GI-NETs: Has proper citation been provided? 3. TABLE SYNOPSIS OF d-NET CASES IN OUR CENTRE: EUS column should be adjusted: Specify if LINEAR EUS was adopted. Within this column only size, echogenic appearance and layer of origin should be reported. 4. Endoscopic and EUS images are of low quality. Please improve them.   5. INTRODUCTION: How was biopsy performed? Endoscopically or EUS-guided? Please clarify. 6. DISCUSSION: typo "of pain abdomen"

7. DISCUSSION: "EUS can detect tumours located in the submucosa and has an important role in assessing the depth of invasion   and lymph node assessment"   the term depth of invasion should modified with layer of origin 8. DISCUSSION: the role of exposed- and non-exposed EFTR for the endoscopic treatment of duodenal NETs, especially those arising from the muscular layer, should be at least mentioned in this section (Granata A et al. Exposed endoscopic full-thickness resection for duodenal submucosal tumors: Current status and future perspectives. World J Gastrointest Endosc. 2022;14(2):77-84)

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Translational Medicine*

Manuscript NO: 85351

Title: Duodenal Neuroendocrine tumor – Tertiary Care Centre Experience

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02936529

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: FRCS (Hon), MD, PhD

Professional title: Professor, Surgical Oncologist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Brazil

Author's Country/Territory: India

Manuscript submission date: 2023-04-23

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-06-07 12:43

Reviewer performed review: 2023-06-15 20:22

Review time: 8 Days and 7 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No scientific significance
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) [Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[ ] Yes [Y] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Neuroendocrine neoplasms (NENs) are a heterogenous group of neoplasms, indeed..and the diagnosis, therapeutics and eventual surveillance of duodenal NENs are challenging, mainly because of rarity. This small but very important series of cases of duodenal NENs is in fact a very concise review on the subject. Despite the quality of the discussion session, the cases presentation are clear with pertinent and illustrative figures. Congratulations for the authors.

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) [Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Editor,　All comments have been properly addressed by the authors. I consider the manuscript suitable for publication.