ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Ms: 1806

Title: Criteria for the diagnosis and severity stratification of acute pancreatitis

Reviewer code: 00503593

Science editor: x.z.huang@wjgnet.com

Date sent for review: 2013-01-07 17:49

Date reviewed: 2013-01-25 19:19

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[Y] Grade A (Excellent)	[Y] Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	[Y] Accept
[ ] Grade B (Very good)	[ ] Grade B: minor language polishing	[ ] Existed	[ ] High priority for publication
[ ] Grade C (Good)	[ ] Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	[ ] No records	
[ ] Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	[ ]Rejection
[ ] Grade E (Poor)	[ ] Grade D: rejected	[ ] Existed	[ ] Minor revision
		[ ] No records	[ ] Major revision

COMMENTS

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS:

This is an excellent article with high clinical value. It is well conducted and well writen. Publishing it would be of great value for clinicians meeting patients with acut pancreatitis.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Ms: 1806

Title: Criteria for the diagnosis and severity stratification of acute pancreatitis

Reviewer code: 00503608

Science editor: x.z.huang@wjgnet.com

Date sent for review: 2013-01-07 17:49

Date reviewed: 2013-02-03 03:09

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A (Excellent)	[ ] Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B (Very good)	[Y] Grade B: minor language polishing	[ ] Existed	[ ] High priority for publication
[Y] Grade C (Good)	[ ] Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	[ ] No records	
[ ] Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade E (Poor)	[ ] Grade D: rejected	[ ] Existed	[ ] Minor revision
		[ ] No records	[Y] Major revision

COMMENTS

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS:

1) The manuscript does have errors of grammar and syntax, and would benefit from editorial review for such errors.

2) The manuscript seems poorly organized. Much of the initial commentary is background, but really should only be summarized in the introduction and then discussed in greater depth in the context of the findings of this study in a discussion section. I suggest that the authors should completely reorganize the manuscript with background/introduction, materials and methods, results, and discussion sections. The abstract should be organized in this fashion as well.

3) There should be more emphasis on the novel findings of the study and less focus on previously published data. There should be more focus and organization in the paper in general.

4) The conclusions are appropriately drawn from the findings, but I would emphasize the impact on cost-savings and the appropriate utilization of resources further.

5) The authors may want to consider discussing and referencing the papers on the revised Atlanta Classification system for pancreatitis and CT severity index that I have uploaded to the web site in the discussion section.

6) In the introduction section, the authors state that it is important to precisely identify severity early in order to decrease the mortality of SAP. Can they provide a reference to justify this statement?