

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 6901

Title: Neoadjuvant Strategies for Pancreatic Cancer

Reviewer code: 02544122

Science editor: Qi, Yuan

Date sent for review: 2013-11-01 11:13

Date reviewed: 2013-11-19 03:38

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"/> Existed	<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"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The review is aimed to an important and actual issue, as is outlined by the title of the paper, and well summarized in the abstract. Materials and Methods section should be presented, in which limits and types of the studies enclosed in the review should be detailed, and a flow chart expressing the criteria of inclusion would be appreciated as far as a table comparing the different studies. Nevertheless, references are well updated and the results are presented in a simple and effective mode. Some minor language polishing are needed.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 6901

Title: Neoadjuvant Strategies for Pancreatic Cancer

Reviewer code: 01200973

Science editor: Qi, Yuan

Date sent for review: 2013-11-01 11:13

Date reviewed: 2013-12-13 16:42

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"/> Existed	<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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. The authors described the radiologic method for staging work up "stages of pancreatic cancer" session. This is not matched. The title has to be changed, or authors commented the "stage" of the pancreatic cancer. 2. "basis for neoadjuvant therapy" The authour should cited the reference for the sentence "Recent meta-analysis done on ealry published~~in the 4th paragraph. 3."Neoadjuvant chemotherapy for LAPC and BRPC" The data cited in this session were almost done for the metastatic pancreatic cancer as palliative treatment, not for the neoadjuvant aims. The objective of neoadjuvant and palliative is quite different, so authors commented "right data" as references.