Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[Y] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The review article seems to be an informative one with a lot of significant information regarding Pancreatic Acinar Cell Carcinoma. This article would be useful for the readers of the journal. Hence, I suggest the manuscript be accepted.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 79372

Title: Pancreatic Acinar Cell Carcinoma: A Comprehensive Review

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03807608

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2022-08-25

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-08-30 03:32

Reviewer performed review: 2022-09-01 01:05

Review time: 1 Day and 21 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] 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	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I want to thank the authors for the opportunity to review this manuscript.   I would like the author to revise several points listed below.   Comments 1.   BCL-10 was useful to diagnosis for acinar cell carcinoma (ACC).   In "Immunohistochemistry" section, you described about BCL-10 only in the table, and you should mention it in the manuscript.

2.   In "Staging for Acinar Pancreatic Carcinoma" section, you mentioned about the AJCC staging and showed Table and Figures.   However, I could not catch up what you want to say or emphasize.   Where there any relationship between staging and prognosis.   Please revise manuscript and Figures to understand what you want to say.

3.   In Figure 1, the magnification was too low to distinguish these patterns.   You should revise these Figure using appropriate magnification. 4. In "Radiological Features" section, ACC had characteristics of extension along the inside of MPD, you should describe it with appropriate references.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 79372

Title: Pancreatic Acinar Cell Carcinoma: A Comprehensive Review

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06237100

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: FEBS, MHSc

Professional title: Research Assistant Professor, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Portugal

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2022-08-25

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-08-25 21:42

Reviewer performed review: 2022-09-04 18:55

Review time: 9 Days and 21 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] 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	[Y] Yes [ ] No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

First, this manuscript provides an extended and comprehensive review of a relevant and poorly researched topic in pancreatic oncology - Pancreatic Acinar Cell Carcinoma. Overall, it has a good quality in terms of organization and presentation. However, some details are worth noting, namely the uniform use of abbreviations [e.g. – p11 (highlighted in bold) – "Solid pseudopapillary neoplasms (SPNs) manifest as large, voluminous pancreatic masses that are clinically comparable to ACC; (…) Typically, SPTs exhibit nuclear immunoreactivity for β-catenin and strong expression of CD10, (…)"; or in p12 the abbreviation of Pancreatic Ductal Adenocarcinomas, PDACs, should be presented earlier (highlighted in bold)   -   "ACCs typically lack the characteristic cytomorphologic features of Pancreatic Ductal Adenocarcinomas (PDACs), allowing these two tumors to be distinguished easily. PDACs typically exhibit "drunk honeycomb".]   Second, illustrations and tables are appropriate, of good quality and fit the paper contents. Nevertheless, some results reported should be checked, as those presented on table 5 - Matos et al. (2009) - ACC Sample size – total – 17; sum of n^o of patients (Resection – 12 + Mixed CHT – 4 + Mixed CRT – 2 = 18), or Seo et al. (2009) - ACC Sample size – total – 20; sum of n^o of patients (Resection – 10 + R & 5FU –   9 + R & Gen – 1 + R & Eto/Cis – 1 = 21).   Third, the manuscript highlights the key points of the review concisely and reasonably, presenting in a proper manner, its relevance and usefulness to daily clinical practice. In this regard, the conclusion appropriately summarizes the evidence that this comprehensive review provided.   Finally, as a suggestion in terms of future directions of the topic, a systematic review should be conducted, and if possible, a metanalysis of the main results/outcomes.