

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 79984

**Title:** Serum biomarkers for the differentiation of autoimmune pancreatitis from pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 06400357

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MMed

**Professional title:** Occupational Physician

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** China

**Author's Country/Territory:** Spain

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-09-20

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-10-11 06:15

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-10-12 09:31

**Review time:** 1 Day and 3 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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

1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? Yes 2 Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? Yes 3 Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? Yes 4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? Yes 5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? Yes 6 Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study? What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field? Yes. This study fully elucidated the serum markers of the difference between AIP and PDAC, which is helpful for more accurate diagnosis of AIP and PDAC in clinical work. 7 Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically? Are the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner? Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper's scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently? Yes. The relevant questions in the Discussion



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

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

section have been specifically addressed to the authors. 8 Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents? Do figures require labeling with arrows, asterisks etc., better legends?

Yes. This manuscript has no figure. 9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? No. 10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? Yes. 11 References. Does the manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections? Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references? Yes. The author has not self-cited, omitted, incorrectly cited and/or over-cited references. 12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate? Yes. 13 Research methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to manuscript type and the appropriate categories, as follows: (1) CARE Checklist (2013) - Case report; (2) CONSORT 2010 Statement - Clinical Trials study, Prospective study, Randomized Controlled trial, Randomized Clinical trial; (3) PRISMA 2009 Checklist - Evidence-Based Medicine, Systematic review, Meta-Analysis; (4) STROBE Statement - Case Control study, Observational study, Retrospective Cohort study; and (5) The ARRIVE Guidelines - Basic study. Did the author prepare the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting? Yes. 14 Ethics statements. For all manuscripts involving human studies and/or animal experiments, author(s) must submit the related formal ethics documents that were reviewed and approved by their local ethical review committee. Did the manuscript meet the requirements of ethics? This manuscript does not address ethics.

The author first reviewed "Serum biomarkers for the differentiation of autoimmunity pancreatitis from pancreatic educational adenocarcinoma". The problems they tried to solve could have a great impact on clinical practice. However, I still have the following



**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>

problems to solve: 1. Whether the author has fully referred to Klaus Felix et al.'s research when elaborating autoantibodies. This research describes the autoantibody spectrum of AIP and PDAC. If not, we think it is necessary to join this research for discussion. 2. As mentioned above, did the author fully refer to the research of Sahar Ghassem Zadeh et al. when elaborating the cytokine spectrum? 3. The discussion part is a little brief, and I hope the author can give the author's opinion on how to combine serum markers or clinical symptoms, and radiology to increase the discrimination between AIP and PDAC. So as to improve the scientificity and practicability of this study. In general, the research is innovative and scientific. Next, the authors should focus on the extent of validation conclusions, that is, whether combining serum markers can improve the ability to differentiate between AIP and PDAC. This can ultimately guide clinical application. I think it is a good manuscript after modifying the above limitations.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 79984

**Title:** Serum biomarkers for the differentiation of autoimmune pancreatitis from pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05688164

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** BSc, MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Research Fellow

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Hungary

**Author's Country/Territory:** Spain

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-09-20

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-10-26 06:17

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-11-03 11:17

**Review time:** 8 Days and 5 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
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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

3 November 2022    Review report on the manuscript titled ‘Serum biomarkers for the differentiation of autoimmune pancreatitis from pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma’ by Caba O, submitted to World Journal of Gastroenterology    Manuscript ID: 79984    Dear Authors,    Differentiating focal autoimmune pancreatitis from pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma poses a diagnostic challenge due to their clinical and radiological overlap. In this manuscript, entitled ‘Serum biomarkers for the differentiation of autoimmune pancreatitis from pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma’, Caba and colleagues reviewed biomarkers for autoimmune pancreatitis and pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma. The strength of this manuscript is that the authors present a timely and fascinating topic, discussing need for differentiating autoimmune pancreatitis from pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma. In general, I think the idea of this paper is really interesting and the authors’ fascinating observations on this timely topic may be of interest to the readers of World Journal of Gastroenterology. However, some comments, as well as some crucial evidence that should be included to support the authors’ argumentation, needed to be addressed to improve the quality of the manuscript, its



adequacy, and its readability prior to the publication in the present form. My overall opinion is to publish this paper after the authors have carefully considered my suggestions below, in particular reshaping parts of the introduction and conclusion sections by adding more evidence. Please consider the following comments: 1.

Abstract: Please expand the abstract with 200 words, proportionally presenting the background, the objectives, the short summary, and the conclusion. The background should contain the general, detailed, and the current issue addressed to this minireview. The conclusion should state the potential and the advance this minireview has provided in the fields. 2. Keywords: Please list the keywords in a way that the first two sentence of the abstract use as many keywords as possible. 3. Core tips: Please expand this section to 100 words, describing content of this manuscript and highlighting the most innovative and important findings and/or arguments. 4. Introduction: As suggested before, I strongly recommend to the authors using more evidence to back their claims, especially in the introduction of this manuscript. So, I recommend in this section fully expand the background to be written in the abstract, clarifying the general background on autoimmune pancreatitis and pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma, detailed background relevant to their biomarkers, and the current issues addressed to the issues including differential biomarkers and the authors believe to be solved, leading to the objectives. Also, I recommend shortly summarizing a sequence of the following sections.

5. Titles of sections: Please avoid using the abbreviation in the section titles. 6.

Tables: I recommend summarizing the contents of some sections in the tables. 7.

In my opinion, I think the conclusions paragraph would benefit from some thoughtful as well as in-depth considerations by the authors. As it stands, it is very descriptive but not enough theoretical as a discussion should be. The authors should make their effort to present the take-home message as experts, explaining the theoretical implication as well as the translational application of their research. Overall, the

manuscript contains no figure, one table, and 45 references. I believe that this manuscript may carry important value discussing the biomarkers to differentiate autoimmune pancreatitis and pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma. hope that, after these careful revisions, the manuscript can meet the Journal's high standards for publication. I am available for a new round of revision of this review. I declare no conflict of interest regarding this manuscript. Best regards, Reviewer