

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Radiology*

Manuscript NO: 84768

Title: Acute Pancreatitis: Structured Report Template of Magnetic Resonance Imaging

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05764344

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Egypt

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-03-27

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-04-23 04:50

Reviewer performed review: 2023-05-05 21:21

Review time: 12 Days and 16 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 Grade E: Do not publish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

Scientific significance of the conclusion in 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 scientific significance
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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	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

- At the section of (Disconnected Pancreatic Duct Syndrome)...(Maatman et al. have confirmed that an increased degree of pancreatic glandular necrosis is associated with the development of DPDS[38].)...Kindly add the number of reference immediately after the name of the author, not at the end of the sentence to unify punctuation. - Starting from this sentence at the end of manuscript: (In summary, AP is a systemic and complex disease. The radiologists need to assist the clinicians in selecting a reasonable imaging modality....), it should be under the title of (Conclusion). - Were the illustrative figures done by the authors or quoted from literature?.....clarify.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Radiology*

Manuscript NO: 84768

Title: Acute Pancreatitis: Structured Report Template of Magnetic Resonance Imaging

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 01557283

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-03-27

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-04-16 10:15

Reviewer performed review: 2023-05-06 00:09

Review time: 19 Days and 13 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 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

Scientific significance of the conclusion in 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 scientific significance
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	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

Summary of the manuscript The authors aimed to facilitate the standardization of MRI in patients with AP. It seems important to consider MRI instead of CT in patients with AP. Therefore, the authors should show their clear conclusion concerning MRI for AP. Major and minor comments. 1. Introduction. But to the best of our knowledge, magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) has additionally important values in the AP severity assessment at early-phase and differential diagnosis of AP-related collection complications. However, there is a lack of corresponding MRI structured report template in this field. Can the authors cite any manuscript in which MRI has important value to evaluate the severity of AP? 2. Imaging indications of acute pancreatitis The description of the authors seems too long as the introduction. 3. Line 111. Imaging techniques of AP. Some scholars have confirmed that the diagnostic value of the DWI technique is equivalent to that of enhanced CT and exceeds the capability of plain CT[20]. The authors should explain the summary of the cited manuscript. 4. The Table 1 and 2 do not seem clear to understand. How can the authors recommend their method of MRI of 1.5 and 3.0 Tesla? 5. The Table 4 should be recreated because it seems too long. 6.

Interpretation and Clinical Value of Evaluation Indexes of Structured Imaging Report. Pancreatic Necrosis. What is the conclusion of the authors concerning the MRI? 7. Local complications. What is the conclusion of the authors concerning the MRI? 8. Disconnected pancreatic duct syndrome. What is the conclusion of the authors concerning the MRI? 9. What is the conclusion of the authors? The authors aimed to facilitate the standardization of MRI report writing and clinical multidisciplinary team communication for AP patients. The authors aimed to facilitate the standardization of MRI in patients with AP. It seems important to consider MRI instead of CT in patients with AP. Therefore, the authors should show their clear conclusion concerning MRI for AP. I cannot find their conclusions.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Radiology*

Manuscript NO: 84768

Title: Acute Pancreatitis: Structured Report Template of Magnetic Resonance Imaging

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05764344

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Egypt

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-03-27

Reviewer chosen by: Ji-Hong Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-05-28 13:35

Reviewer performed review: 2023-05-28 13:46

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Peer-reviewer statements	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

All my required corrections were done.