



ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 19549

Title: PANCREATIC FLUID COLLECTIONS: WHAT IS THE IDEAL IMAGING TECHNIQUE?

Reviewer's code: 03257946

Reviewer's country: Poland

Science editor: Jing Yu

Date sent for review: 2015-05-14 16:19

Date reviewed: 2015-05-19 19:24

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 checked="" 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"/> 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

WHAT IS THE IDEAL IMAGING TECHNIQUE for PANCREATIC FLUID COLLECTIONS is currently being debated. The work reviewed in detail compares different imaging techniques in this regard. The presentation of data is clear, the title, abstract and different parts of manuscript are correct. Minor: 1. I did not find short title. 2. Page numbers are missing. 3. Typos: This delineates the importance of EUS in further management planning. 3. Punctuation marks, capital letters "Management of different types of organized collections differs because of the variable quantity of debris, While patients with pseudocysts can be drained by straight-forward stent placement, walled-off necrosis (WON) requires multi-disciplinary approach. " Major: 1. "CECT is widely used imaging modality for the diagnosis and staging of AP due to its excellent capacity to demonstrate early inflammatory changes as well as local and systemic complications ..." Can the authors precise, what other systemic complications may be taken into account? 2. I wonder whether, in the section on transabdominal ultrasonography author should consider the role of contrast-enhanced transabdominal ultrasound (CEUS). 3. "Revised Atlanta classification



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>

recommended CECT to be done at 5 to 7 day of pancreatitis ..." and "The CT severity index is an attempt to improve the early prognostic value." In order to be more precise, we can not describe prediction of acute pancreatitis as early assessing the CTSI at 5 to 7 day of disease. 4. I think it is worth noting in the section concerning EUS its importance in determining the etiology of pancreatitis (Biliary microlithiasis in the biliary duct or gallbladder.)



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: 19549

Title: PANCREATIC FLUID COLLECTIONS: WHAT IS THE IDEAL IMAGING TECHNIQUE?

Reviewer's code: 02823695

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Jing Yu

Date sent for review: 2015-05-14 16:19

Date reviewed: 2015-06-08 08:59

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

This is a very well written review of the current imaging modalities for pancreatic fluid collections. There is no mention or comparison of cost and availability of the various imaging techniques and I feel this should be discussed in the review alongside advantages/disadvantages of each modality. On page 7 second paragraph, there is discussion of solid debris >40% requiring DEN or surgical intervention. Please also include recent studies suggesting placement of EUS-guided large bore metallic stent, without the need for DEN has also shown safe and effective resolution of WON.



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: 19549

Title: PANCREATIC FLUID COLLECTIONS: WHAT IS THE IDEAL IMAGING TECHNIQUE?

Reviewer's code: 02954055

Reviewer's country: Germany

Science editor: Jing Yu

Date sent for review: 2015-05-14 16:19

Date reviewed: 2015-05-27 05:40

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input checked="" 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 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

-