



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

**Manuscript NO:** 84369

**Title:** Inflammatory myofibroblastic tumor of the pancreatic neck misdiagnosed as neuroendocrine tumor: A case report

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 06288088

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Assistant Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-03-10

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-03-10 18:22

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-03-23 04:31

**Review time:** 12 Days and 10 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Novelty of this manuscript</b>	<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
<b>Creativity or innovation of this manuscript</b>	<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



# Baishideng Publishing Group

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<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
<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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

It was a well-written case report with a suitable contrast enhanced CT scan approach. I suggest accepting the case report.



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

**Manuscript NO:** 84369

**Title:** Inflammatory myofibroblastic tumor of the pancreatic neck misdiagnosed as neuroendocrine tumor: A case report

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 00070504

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor, Professor, Surgeon

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-03-10

**Reviewer chosen by:** Geng-Long Liu

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-04-07 18:08

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-04-07 19:50

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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
<b>Novelty of this manuscript</b>	<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
<b>Creativity or innovation of this manuscript</b>	<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**

Manuscript NO: 84369 Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology Manuscript Type: CASE REPORT Inflammatory myofibroblastic tumor of the pancreatic neck misdiagnosed as neuroendocrine tumor: A case report I read with interest the study titled "Inflammatory myofibroblastic tumor of the neck of the pancreas, which was mistakenly diagnosed as a neuroendocrine tumor: A case report". The authors presented a rare case of inflammatory myofibroblastic tumor. First of all, the references start from 4 in the introduction part. No reference is used in the abstract. Please check. In addition, plain CT was used as the imaging method. What is the reason why they do not prefer a method such as EUS, MR or PET? Why was FNAB not done? Please explain. What is your reason for not considering enucleation for this mass with benign features? Please show the mass with an arrow in Figure 1. Best regards



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

**Manuscript NO:** 84369

**Title:** Inflammatory myofibroblastic tumor of the pancreatic neck misdiagnosed as neuroendocrine tumor: A case report

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05068435

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-03-10

**Reviewer chosen by:** Geng-Long Liu

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-04-09 03:56

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-04-11 05:03

**Review time:** 2 Days and 1 Hour

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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
<b>Novelty of this manuscript</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
<b>Creativity or innovation of this manuscript</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Title: inflammatory myofibroblastic tumor of pancreatic neck mimicking as neuro-endocrine tumor: A case report    could be an another crisp and clear title. History of present illness should have been little more elaborative regarding symptoms and presentation. Why the CECT done straight forwardly unless the presenting symptoms and history of present illness suggested that investigation. Is the pancreatic mass is growing without any symptoms has not been mentioned. If patient is on follow up in some hospital and referred to your hospital for treatment, since how long they have been following up? I believe clarity on these points are essential. Rest of the part in discussion is well written.