

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 74269

Title: Higher volume growth rate is associated with development of worrisome features in patients with Branch Duct-Intraductal Papillary Mucinous Neoplasms

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03474273

Position: Associate Editor

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Chief Doctor, Director, Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2021-12-21

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-12-22 01:25

Reviewer performed review: 2021-12-22 02:23

Review time: 1 Hour

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| Scientific quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish |
| Language quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection |
| Conclusion | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection |
| Re-review | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |

| | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| Peer-reviewer statements | Peer-Review: [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] Anonymous [<input type="radio"/>] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [<input type="radio"/>] Yes [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] No |
|-------------------------------------|---|

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The study identified volume growth rate is associated with development of worrisome features in patients with Branch Duct-Intraductal Papillary Mucinous Neoplasms. However, several major concerns limit the quality of the study. 1. The cyst volume measurement is the same thing as diameter measurement. In addition, 3 baseline cyst diameters should be measured to determine the cyst volume, the inter-observer variability will be greater than cyst diameter measure alone. 2. Inter-observer agreement should be analyzed between different radiologists. 3. The diameter growth rate is a risk factor for BD-IPMN. The cysts that have higher growth rate is potentially more aggressive than other cysts. Therefore, the relationship between diameter growth and high risk feature has no significance. 4. The follow up time is not sufficient as BD-IPMN develop very slow.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 74269

Title: Higher volume growth rate is associated with development of worrisome features in patients with Branch Duct-Intraductal Papillary Mucinous Neoplasms

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 00054255

Position: Editor-in-Chief

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Consultant Physician-Scientist, Doctor, Full Professor, Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: South Korea

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2021-12-21

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-12-23 07:18

Reviewer performed review: 2021-12-29 06:26

Review time: 5 Days and 23 Hours

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| Scientific quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish |
| Language quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection |
| Conclusion | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection |
| Re-review | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |

| | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| Peer-reviewer statements | Peer-Review: [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] Anonymous [<input type="checkbox"/>] Onymous |
| | Conflicts-of-Interest: [<input type="checkbox"/>] Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No |

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Branch duct type intraductal papillary mucinous neoplasms(BD0IPMNs) is difficult to assess whether it is benign or has malignant potential. Therefore, Fukuoka guidelines and a nomogram predicting the individual risk of malignancy(JY Jang et al. Ann Surg 266(6):1062) for this difficult issue were proposed. Criticisms: 1. Ten of 98 patients developed worrisome features from non-worrisome features for a median follow-up duration of 40.5 months. No patient has high-risk stigmata. The median diameter of the cyst was 19 (11.25-21.25). Then what kinds of findings were included the worrisome features for each patient after 40.5 months follow-up. There are no findings in table 2. belonging to worrisome features that authors proposed in the materials and methods. 2. What is the volume measuring equation? Authors used sagittal (antero-posterior) x transversal (latero-lateral) x coronal (cranio-caudal). This is a rough volume. Comment about is to be added in the discussion. 3. Regarding table 5& 6: Baseline cyst size and final cyst size, both were classified to non-worrisome features(88) and worrisome features(10). As authors described and I mentioned in criticism 1, the authors used 98 patients for this study, who have non-worrisome features. What is the timeline of the baseline and final? 4. Practically, just measuring the longest diameter can be used easily rather than the calculation of the volume. What is the comparative analysis between the increase of the longest diameter and the volume increase for prediction going to worrisome feature?

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 74269

Title: Higher volume growth rate is associated with development of worrisome features in patients with Branch Duct-Intraductal Papillary Mucinous Neoplasms

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03474273

Position: Associate Editor

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Chief Doctor, Director, Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2021-12-21

Reviewer chosen by: Ze-Mao Gong

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-03-23 11:09

Reviewer performed review: 2022-03-23 11:36

Review time: 1 Hour

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| Scientific quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish |
| Language quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection |
| Conclusion | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection |
| Peer-reviewer | Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous |



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The revised paper is resonable and logical. I have no further comment.