

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 70356

Title: Pancreatic cancer incidence and mortality patterns in 2006-2015 and prediction of

the epidemiological trend to 2025 in China

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06035444

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MSc

Professional title: Academic Research, Research Assistant, Research Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Ethiopia

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-07-31

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-07-31 12:20

Reviewer performed review: 2021-08-11 18:44

Review time: 11 Days and 6 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[] Grade A: Priority publishing [] Grade B: Minor language polishing [Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	 [] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No



Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous
statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Please consider to assess the predictors of incidence and mortality of PC

General comment

This research is an important area of public health concern as addressing the gap will help in reducing incidence and mortality from PC. The study that tried to explore the incidence, mortality and predicted it's of 2025.

The article is not well organized and the authors need to read the works again as there are many grammatical errors all through the work

Specific comments

Abstract:

- lacks coherences
- > the authors failed to state the problem statement in the background section
- why the authors missed to mention the statistical methods, the variables forecasted for 2025
- the result section needs rearrangement
- > conclusion: why the authors failed to mention doable recommendation

Introduction

The authors failed to connect their study with the current sustainable development goals Methods

The authors used secondary databases as source of the information and determine incidence of PC and Mortality, and estimated incidence of PC and mortality for 2025 however, why the authors missed to identify predictors of PC? I expected the predictors, and incidence and mortality of PC.

The authors only used 368 registries from a total of 501. What were the criteria to exclude

the 133 registries?

Results

"According to the CANCER TODAY database, the age-standardized rates of PC



incidence were 5.3 vs 4.9 per 100,000 in China and the world, and were similar with other developing countries, e.g. Brazil and Russia (4.6-7.4 per 100,000) (Supplementary table 1a). Why the author said the incidence was similar with other developing countries without calculating confidence interval for the incidence? What was the justification for it? Why the authors have mentioned the above countries sometimes as developing and developed? Correct the inconsistency across all the documents. Discussion:

The discussion is not in line with the main findings. Please minimize the discussion section and add the implication of the findings to local, national and international level policy makers.



RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 70356

Title: Pancreatic cancer incidence and mortality patterns in 2006-2015 and prediction of

the epidemiological trend to 2025 in China

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06035444

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MSc

Professional title: Academic Research, Research Assistant, Research Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Ethiopia

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-07-31

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ping Yan

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-09-27 04:34

Reviewer performed review: 2021-10-05 08:58

Review time: 8 Days and 4 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	 [] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	 [] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous





statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you, i have no comments, all comments have addressed.