

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 92641

Title: Type one autoimmune pancreatitis based on clinical diagnosis : A case report and literature review

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03765413

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Romania

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2024-02-03

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2024-02-04 11:08

Reviewer performed review: 2024-02-04 11:57

Review time: 1 Hour

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 Grade E: Do not publish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 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in 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 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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

Authors tried to make a differential diagnosis of their case with pancreatic cancer, although there was no clear imagistic evidence of any distinct mass within the pancreas. I suggest refraining from this. They should clarify what does "pancreatic occupancy" means. I suggest re-writing it as pancreatic swelling. It is not clear what "not discharged" means in regard to autoimmune hepatic cholangitis. And how did they diagnosed it as the autoimmune biomarkers were normal. Most likely in this case the cholestasis and intrahepatic ducts enlargement was mechanical. The manuscript should be proofread. Authors were not clear how they ruled out Hepatitis C. They used two substances (Bisabolol and Glucuronolactone) that as far as I know are not backed by any Clinical Trial in AIP and their effect is at least controversial as Glucuronolactone is not clear if it is safe for human use. CDFI should be spelled out. No pancreatic ultrasound elastometry used in follow-up. They should re-write the Acknowledgements section, as you can not thank yourself for writing the article. Probably they meant Author Contribution but still it needs rewriting.