

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 14402

Title: Endoscopic ultrasound guided drainage of pancreatic fluid collections in acute pancreatitis

Reviewer code: 02510223

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2014-10-01 11:11

Date reviewed: 2014-10-08 20:40

| CLASSIFICATION | LANGUAGE EVALUATION | RECOMMENDATION | CONCLUSION |
|---|---|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing | Google Search: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> Existing | <input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> No records | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair | | BPG Search: | <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected | <input type="checkbox"/> Existing | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> No records | |

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

EUS guided drainage has become first line management option of PFCs in acute pancreatitis. So we support your review that discuss the EUS guided drainage of PFCs in acute pancreatitis.

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 14402

Title: Endoscopic ultrasound guided drainage of pancreatic fluid collections in acute pancreatitis

Reviewer code: 02510223

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2014-10-01 11:11

Date reviewed: 2014-10-08 20:41

| CLASSIFICATION | LANGUAGE EVALUATION | RECOMMENDATION | CONCLUSION |
|---|---|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing | Google Search: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> Existing | <input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> No records | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair | | BPG Search: | <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected | <input type="checkbox"/> Existing | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> No records | |

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

EUS guided drainage has become first line management option of PFCs in acute pancreatitis. So we support your review that discuss the EUS guided drainage of PFCs in acute pancreatitis.

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 14402

Title: Endoscopic ultrasound guided drainage of pancreatic fluid collections in acute pancreatitis

Reviewer code: 02510721

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2014-10-01 11:11

Date reviewed: 2014-10-09 17:31

| CLASSIFICATION | LANGUAGE EVALUATION | RECOMMENDATION | CONCLUSION |
|---|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing | Google Search: | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> Existing | <input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> No records | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair | | BPG Search: | <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected | <input type="checkbox"/> Existing | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> No records | |

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The abstract needs a brief comment about the therapeutic indications of EUS guided drainage. In the introduction is not correct to place the acute necrotic collection in the first phase of SAP. This evolution is appropriate of late phase of SAP. The study of Akshintala et al develops its personal observations not confirmed about the pancreatic pseudocysts that on the contrary are a well defined lesions in the literature. In the section "review of literature", the Authors refer about some papers that present various series of patients with pancreatic pseudocysts treated with EUS guided procedures of drainage. This paper in the field of clinical study has the major defect of presenting therapeutic procedure (EUS guided drainage) to be used for a pancreatic lesion that the Authors do not define adequately. So you can create dangerous confusion in the therapeutic choices. The study appears as a large and confused presentation of some papers, without clinical criteria and with emphasis of technical details of the endoscopic procedures. The content and development of the study concerns technical characteristics of the procedure and its results, out of diagnostic and therapeutic scenario of evolution of pancreatitis. In my opinion the development and the type of the study suggest the change of the title of the paper, using the following: Endoscopic ultrasound guided drainage of pancreatic fluid collections: assessment of the procedure, technical details and review of the literature

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 14402

Title: Endoscopic ultrasound guided drainage of pancreatic fluid collections in acute pancreatitis

Reviewer code: 00069827

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2014-10-01 11:11

Date reviewed: 2014-10-01 15:11

| CLASSIFICATION | LANGUAGE EVALUATION | RECOMMENDATION | CONCLUSION |
|--|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing | Google Search: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> Existing | <input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> No records | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair | | BPG Search: | <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected | <input type="checkbox"/> Existing | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> No records | |

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I would like to commend the authors for presenting a concise and well-structured review on this interesting topic. Clearly, there is still an open question what are the benefits and limitations of the endoscopic management of peripancreatic fluid collection in acute pancreatitis. Furthermore, the role of endoscopic ultrasound in this context has not been adequately discussed in recent literature and there is a need for a systematic review of available data. The research team has successfully contributed to this field by adding just another important paper. Overall, little criticism could be expressed regarding this study. The aim and goals of the study, methodology and results sections are comprehensive and clear. There is little or no repetition of the information presented in the text and tables. English language requires minor polishing. I would strongly support the publication of this paper in the World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 14402

Title: Endoscopic ultrasound guided drainage of pancreatic fluid collections in acute pancreatitis

Reviewer code: 00068044

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2014-10-01 11:11

Date reviewed: 2014-10-10 22:55

| CLASSIFICATION | LANGUAGE EVALUATION | RECOMMENDATION | CONCLUSION |
|---|---|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing | Google Search: | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> Existing | <input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> No records | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected | BPG Search: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor | | <input type="checkbox"/> Existing | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> No records | |

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. What is the indication of EUS guided drainage of PFCs? 2. In the part of review of literature, some contents are similar to the previous. 3. The manuscript quoted a large number of literature to prove the advantages of EUS guided drainage of PFCs, what is the disadvantages? 4. In the part of review of literature, author most study are retrospective case report or case control study, can authors quote more articles of system evaluation to increase persuasion?