

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

**Manuscript NO:** 42569

**Title:** Pancreatoscopy: an up-date

**Reviewer's code:** 00183302

**Reviewer's country:** Pakistan

**Science editor:** Xue-Jiao Wang

**Date sent for review:** 2018-09-28

**Date reviewed:** 2018-10-08

**Review time:** 10 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input 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 a simple review paper.

### INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

*Google Search:*



**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

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

***BPG Search:***

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

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

**Manuscript NO:** 42569

**Title:** Pancreatoscopy: an up-date

**Reviewer's code:** 00504708

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Xue-Jiao Wang

**Date sent for review:** 2018-10-12

**Date reviewed:** 2018-10-14

**Review time:** 2 Days

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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input 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 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 type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input type="checkbox"/> No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I commend the authors in the comprehensive review of pancreatoscopy and its associated diagnostic and therapeutic utility. It is well written, well researched and well referenced. I would like to know specifically what the pancreatic fluid is sent for in terms of analysis for malignancy. I would appreciate more detail on the use of special



**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

methods to delineate strictures including NBI and Endo microscopy. Has FISH and DIA been used? I would appreciate an expansion on the use of pancreatic lithotripsy-generator settings, catheters used and need for standard ERCP maneuvers for stone clearance and how are main pancreatic duct strictures dealt with which are common in chronic pancreatitis. The paper is very good. It does need more proof reading in that page 4 "stone lithotripsy" and page 14 pancreatoscopy.

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

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

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

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

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

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

**Manuscript NO:** 42569

**Title:** Pancreatoscopy: an up-date

**Reviewer's code:** 01714826

**Reviewer's country:** India

**Science editor:** Xue-Jiao Wang

**Date sent for review:** 2018-10-12

**Date reviewed:** 2018-10-18

**Review time:** 5 Days

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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input 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 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 type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input type="checkbox"/> No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Authors Deluca et al have attempted to review an exciting avenue in the pancreato-biliary endoscopy. Pancreatoscopy : an update manages to touch upon important aspects of the procedure including indications and complications. Here are a few of my comments: 1. At the outset, considerable improvement of language is



**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

required before approval for publication. There are many grammatical and inappropriate use of non-medical words that needs to be addressed. 2. A Box enumerating the indications of pancreatoscopy according to the authors who have reviewed the subject extensively would be very useful to the reader 3. Although we usually perform a pancreatoscopy with a prior sphincterotomy, it would seem intuitive to recommend it considering the diameter of the scope and ease of therapeutics if and when required. Moreover, in our experience, we have found the scope to be easily damaged when used in sub optimal conditions and this may have an impact on financial feasibility of the procedure 4. Use of lithotripsy to achieve ductal clearance in calcific pancreatitis with a pancreatoscope has been postulated to be an important indication of this procedure. However, it would be interesting to see if mere 'ductal clearance' translated to clinical benefit, especially in patients with multiple stones and strictures in addition to parenchymal calcifications and branch duct stones. Therefore, the utility of this modality is reserved in select few patients where a single large stone with or without a stricture obstructs the duct and even a stent cannot be passed distally. It would be worthwhile examining the 'true' indications of lithotripsy in CCP by identifying the specific sub group that may benefit from this procedure 5. All in all, Pancreatoscopy seems to be a procedure that should be reserved in a very specific sub group of patients with a limited scope of benefit. I would suggest re-drafting the article to explore these sub groups which might be of more value for the reader.

## INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

### *Google Search:*

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism



**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>**

[ Y ] No

***BPG Search:***

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[ Y ] No

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

**Manuscript NO:** 42569

**Title:** Pancreatoscopy: an up-date

**Reviewer's code:** 03000523

**Reviewer's country:** Croatia

**Science editor:** Xue-Jiao Wang

**Date sent for review:** 2018-10-12

**Date reviewed:** 2018-10-19

**Review time:** 6 Days

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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input type="checkbox"/> No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Editor, With a great interest I read the manuscript from De Luca et.al. Although the pancreatoscopy is promising and useful technique and the paper has been written in a good way I can not recommend it for publication because it resembles more on the book chapter than scientific paper. Core tip: „Considering its therapeutic role,



**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

pancreatoscopy with lithotripsy has achieved an high rates of ductal clearance in patients with chronic calcific.” • This sentence seems not finished? Equipments and technique “...ringer’s solution” Please correct into capital letter R

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

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

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

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

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