

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 76971

Title: Enhanced EUS imaging for pancreatic lesions: the road to artificial intelligence

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 01221925

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: AGAF, FACS, FICS, MD, PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Greece

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2022-04-09

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-04-09 10:14

Reviewer performed review: 2022-04-09 10:57

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 Grade E: Do not publish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 type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
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

This is a very interesting paper with the authors providing us an overview of the advantages and the disadvantages of EUS (including contrast-enhanced) in the diagnosis of early stage pancreatic lesions/cancer, as well as the potential role of AI. Could the authors provide in a section before the conclusions, their proposals for the best possible use of these modalities, possibly as an algorithm for clinical practice/

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 76971

Title: Enhanced EUS imaging for pancreatic lesions: the road to artificial intelligence

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05548733

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Thailand

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2022-04-09

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-04-13 00:14

Reviewer performed review: 2022-04-24 14:27

Review time: 11 Days and 14 Hours

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
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous

statements

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a minireview on enhanced EUS imaging for pancreatic lesions. The authors cover elastography, contrast enhanced EUS, and AI in the field of EUS. The review is concise yet the relevant information and literature review are completed. The content of this review is helpful to the readers. Minor comments 1. There are a few typos and missing space between two words, please recheck. 2. Page 8, "The major advantage of CELMI-US over CEHMI-EUS..." CELMI-US should be changed to CELMI-EUS.