

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 82925

**Title:** Diagnostic accuracy of apparent diffusion coefficient to differentiate intrapancreatic accessory spleen from pancreatic neuroendocrine tumors

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 04543416

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Chief Doctor, Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-12-30

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-01-01 07:57

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-01-01 14:48

**Review time:** 6 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" 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 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

Dear Authors, The use of the expression (< 3cm) in the title of the article was not appropriate. It will be sufficient to specify what is meant by small in the material method section. Gadopentetate dimeglumine is the content of Magnevist. I am not sure if a drug with this content is produced by GE Healthcare. Please verify the composition of the contrast agent used. In how many of the patients was the diagnosis of IPAS made histopathologically? There is no precise information about this in the article. Please specify the material in the method section. The work you use as the first reference almost exactly coincides with your work. Therefore, please compare the results of the study of Pandey A. et al. in detail in the discussion section. Please add to the limitations that not all IPASs were diagnosed histopathologically. Best regards,

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 82925

**Title:** Diagnostic accuracy of apparent diffusion coefficient to differentiate intrapancreatic accessory spleen from pancreatic neuroendocrine tumors

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 04423126

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** FACS

**Professional title:** Chief Doctor, Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-12-30

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-01-06 06:25

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-01-06 06:38

**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
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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" 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 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

A very interesting and well thought-out retrospective analysis is presented here. The aim of this work was to prevent unnecessary surgery in IPAS patients. Unfortunately, no information can be obtained from the manuscript as to whether this goal was achieved. There is a lack of essential data on the patients examined. Especially how many IPAS patients were operated on. The radiologist is certainly pleased with the good results. However, the clinician wonders whether this is a relevant problem at all.