

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastrointestinal Pathophysiology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 21183

**Title:** Intra-abdominal pressure - Time ripe to revise management guidelines of acute pancreatitis?

**Reviewer's code:** 00068891

**Reviewer's country:** China

**Science editor:** Yue-Li Tian

**Date sent for review:** 2015-07-04 15:21

**Date reviewed:** 2015-07-15 18:39

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"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	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

Intra abdominal hypertension (IAH) / abdominal compartment syndrome (ACS) is reported to be associated with a higher APACHE II score and multi-organ syndrome (MODS) in severe acute pancreatitis (SAP) and the causal relationship between IAH/ACS and MODS remains to be established. This paper reviewed the epidemiology, pathophysiology of IAH/ACS in SAP and it is much helpful both for the surgeons and the clinicians in the management of SAP. Further studies are needed to observe the role that the IAH/ACS plays in the pathogenesis, the severity and the prognosis in a large population of the patients with SAP.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastrointestinal Pathophysiology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 21183

**Title:** Intra-abdominal pressure - Time ripe to revise management guidelines of acute pancreatitis?

**Reviewer's code:** 00069230

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Yue-Li Tian

**Date sent for review:** 2015-07-04 15:21

**Date reviewed:** 2015-07-16 03:15

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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input 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 type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input 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 type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this manuscript Jaipuria et. al evaluate the epidemiology comprising intra abdominal hypertension (IAH) and severe acute pancreatitis (SAP). Various mechanisms involved in the development of SAP are considered. The authors perform an extensive review on the current literature which they provide as evidence for their conclusion. This is an attractive and relevant paper. Minor Comments: - The manuscript has to be revised to ensure it is the final version and not a draft as at several instances it seems the authors were not sure which word to use and provided two possibilities. A few of these examples found in the manuscript are: course/outcomes; abdomen/gut; complications/severity; renal arteries/kidneys; studies/arguments; surveillance/intervention, etc. - The grammar has to be revised.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastrointestinal Pathophysiology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 21183

**Title:** Intra-abdominal pressure - Time ripe to revise management guidelines of acute pancreatitis?

**Reviewer's code:** 00069137

**Reviewer's country:** Mexico

**Science editor:** Yue-Li Tian

**Date sent for review:** 2015-07-04 15:21

**Date reviewed:** 2015-07-14 09:45

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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input 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

The review is well written, well argued, and evidently the authors have dominion over the field and are knowledgeable of the existing literature. I have some comments on the manuscript. At times the manuscript appears to be opinionated and more suitable for an editorial than a scholarly review. The authors claim a meta-analysis is impossible while one such attempt (although somewhat flawed) already exists in the literature (van Brunschot et al, 2014). The authors manage to discuss at some length the relevance of the topic being reviewed. However, one major disadvantage is that the review is not timely. There are at least 3 review papers on the same topic in the last year (Including references 53 and 46), and other very recent ones not mentioned in the text (Bratisl Lek Listy. 2013;114(3):166-71, for example). The conclusions are therefore similar to these recent reviews, diminishing the present papers originality. Other than these pressing issues, I believe the paper is interesting and valuable, especially in an open-access context.