

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 82287

**Title:** Role of endoscopic ultrasound (EUS) in the characterization of solid pseudopapillary neoplasm (SPN) of the pancreas

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 03727100

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Assistant Professor, Doctor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-12-22

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-01-05 23:54

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-01-07 12:40

**Review time:** 1 Day and 12 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<b>Language quality</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input 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 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

Thank you for giving me the chance to review the manuscript entitled “Role of endoscopic ultrasound (EUS) in the characterization of solid pseudopapillary neoplasm (SPN) of the pancreas”. The data of this study is precious. However, more considerations are necessary for effectively treating the data. I hope that the authors will excellently revise the manuscript.

1. The authors couldn’t achieve the aim. The aim of this study was to determine the characteristic EUS features of SPN. Can authors make the flowchart of diagnosing SPN by using the combination of EUS features? When the authors can’t make the flowchart for diagnosing SPN, the authors make the check list of EUS findings? The flow chart or checklist will be helpful for many pancreaticobiliary specialists.
2. As described above, the authors couldn’t achieve the aim. Besides, the results of FNA/FNB were described. SPN is sometimes cystic lesion, therefore the way by which we should perform EUS-FNA is very interesting. When there are no characteristic EUS findings of SPN, I recommend that you compare the diagnosability and tissue sampling rate of SPN between EUS-FNA and EUS-FNB.
3. The explanations of echotexture and elastography (Figure 1-6) should be described in

“Methods” section. 4. If past reports described that SPN was often seen in female, Table 5 might be unnecessary. 5. In the first place, two investigations were involved in the study (EUS findings, and EUS-FNA). This is confusing. Therefore, the authors couldn’t describe the procedural detail of EUS evaluation and EUS-FNA in methods section. If possible, the authors should limit only investigation (EUS findings or FNA). In other words, the authors should divide the report into two reports (a report: EUS findings for diagnosing SPN, the other: EUS-FNA vs FNB for diagnosing SPN).

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 82287

**Title:** Role of endoscopic ultrasound (EUS) in the characterization of solid pseudopapillary neoplasm (SPN) of the pancreas

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 02510728

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-12-22

**Reviewer chosen by:** Dong-Mei Wang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-01-30 04:53

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-02-02 06:52

**Review time:** 3 Days and 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
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<b>Language quality</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input 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

This study was conducted in centers with a high annual number of patients. The number of patients is sufficient for the results.