



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,  
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://** www.wjgnet.com

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**Manuscript NO:** 40181

**Title:** Coexistence of IPMN and malignant IPNB complicated by pancreatobiliary fistula:  
A case report

**Reviewer's code:** 00057492

**Reviewer's country:** Italy

**Science editor:** Xue-Jiao Wang

**Date sent for review:** 2018-10-11

**Date reviewed:** 2018-10-11

**Review time:** 6 Hours

| SCIENTIFIC QUALITY                                | LANGUAGE QUALITY  | CONCLUSION   | PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS                      |
|---|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent       | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing       | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept                    | Peer-Review:                                  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language | (High priority)                                    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good | polishing   | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair            | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of           | (General priority)                                 | Peer-reviewer's expertise on the              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not          | language polishing  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision | topic of the manuscript:                      |
| publish   | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision            | <input type="checkbox"/> Advanced             |
|   |   | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General   |
|   |   |  | <input type="checkbox"/> No expertise         |
|   |   |  | Conflicts-of-Interest:                        |
|   |   |  | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes                  |
|   |   |  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No        |

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting case report dealing with an unusual coexistence of two different pancreatic tumors. The authors should be congratulated for their approach to diagnosis using novel technologies. It would be useful to state also in the abstract that the patient



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,  
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://** www.wjgnet.com

eventually underwent pylorus-preserving pancreaticoduodenectomy. In addition, the authors should state whether this is the first reported case or there have been others. In case of similar previous reports, a comparison should be made in the discussion section of the manuscript.

#### **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

##### ***Google Search:***

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

##### ***BPG Search:***

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,  
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://** www.wjgnet.com

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**Manuscript NO:** 40181

**Title:** Coexistence of IPMN and malignant IPNB complicated by pancreatobiliary fistula:  
A case report

**Reviewer's code:** 02505244

**Reviewer's country:** Italy

**Science editor:** Xue-Jiao Wang

**Date sent for review:** 2018-10-11

**Date reviewed:** 2018-10-15

**Review time:** 4 Days

| SCIENTIFIC QUALITY                                     | LANGUAGE QUALITY   | CONCLUSION                                 | PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS                      |
|--|--|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept            | Peer-Review:                                  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language                 | (High priority)                            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good                 | polishing  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept | <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of                | (General priority)                         | Peer-reviewer's expertise on the              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not               | language polishing   | <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision    | topic of the manuscript:                      |
| publish  | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection                      | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision    | <input type="checkbox"/> Advanced             |
|  |  | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General   |
|  |  |  | <input type="checkbox"/> No expertise         |
|  |  |  | Conflicts-of-Interest:                        |
|  |  |  | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes                  |
|  |  |  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No        |

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The Case Report presented is interesting, well-written, easily readable and correctly prepared in accordance to the CARE checklist. Both the Abstract and Core Tip sections effectively summarize the paper content. Introduction is fairly short and informative.

Case Report is precisely presented and described. The Discussion section appears a bit too long but contains valuable information. A reasonable amount of appropriate References is included. Images are clear and illustrative of the paper content.

#### **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

##### ***Google Search:***

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

##### ***BPG Search:***

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No