



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 19599

Title: Features associated with progression of small pancreatic cystic lesions: A retrospective study

Reviewer's code: 02663148

Reviewer's country: Spain

Science editor: Jing Yu

Date sent for review: 2015-05-15 13:31

Date reviewed: 2015-06-04 03:17

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear authors, thanks for submitting your interesting research of imaging features associated to progression of small pancreatic cyst to WJG. The number of cases is large and the follow-up time long. The main weakness of your investigation is the lack of histological correlation, although in spite of it, interesting and new data are derived. Anyhow, before publication in this journal, I believe some minor details have to be better addressed, such as: - Abstract: the number of patients included in the study belongs to material and method section, not to results - Core tip: please eliminate the sentence: "Surveillance, however, is associated with concern, anxiety, and fear about the uncertainty of the diagnosis and the natural history of these cysts". The following affirmation is not a direct conclusion from your study: " Our findings may be helpful to stratify patients into those who require further cystic fluid testing and those who can be observed in a more lenient manner.". It should be analyzed in the discussion, but not is part of the core tip Material and method and results section: please, specify the imaging methods were used for comparison specifically in each group and for each time point. Also, you should refer if there was any difference when different imaging methods were used



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

in the identification of the analyzed imaging features I hope these comments can be of your interest
Best regards



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 19599

Title: Features associated with progression of small pancreatic cystic lesions: A retrospective study

Reviewer's code: 03251601

Reviewer's country: United Kingdom

Science editor: Jing Yu

Date sent for review: 2015-05-15 13:31

Date reviewed: 2015-07-05 05:27

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Authors Thank you for an interesting submission. I have made a few suggestions in the attached word document. The majority of these are grammatical, and relate to improving sentence structure. There is a great amount of detail regarding imaging protocols, and I am uncertain if this descriptive level is needed. It would however be helpful to identify if patients had the same imaging modality on follow-up scans. Within the abstract it would be useful to have the size range (mm) of pancreatic cysts encountered in your study. I presume that none of the patients underwent EUS or cyst examination, and perhaps this can be made clear in the patient selection section. In summary though, these changes should be relatively minor for you to adjust, and I hope that it will help improve the impact of your research findings.