

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 83963

Title: Inflammatory myofibroblastic tumor of the distal common bile duct: Literature review with focus on pathological examination

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 00070509

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: South Korea

Author's Country/Territory: Belgium

Manuscript submission date: 2023-02-17

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-02-18 08:43

Reviewer performed review: 2023-02-24 01:40

Review time: 5 Days and 16 Hours

	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C:
Scientific quality	Good
	[Y] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair
this manuscript	[] Grade D: No creativity or innovation



Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	 [] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No scientific significance
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) [] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[]Yes [Y]No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript entitled 'Pancreatic inflammatory myofibroblastic tumor: current update.' is basically a case report of IMT occurred in the distal CBD. I think this is a well-written manuscript but there are some points to be revised. 1. Is this a pancreatic IMT or not? According to the authors' descriptions and gross photo (Fig. 1), this is a intraluminal polypoid mass of distal CBD (intrapancreatitic or juxtapancreatic?). So, the title of this manuscript could be revised. 2. Pancreatic IMT is a rare tumor. Most of the manuscript was composed of general findings of the IMT. So, the reviewer proposed the revision of the title. For example, 'IMT of the distal CBD: a case report and literature review.' 3. As you already mentioned "It was regarded as an inflammatory pseudotumor until it was officially considered a separate entity by the World Health Organization (WHO) in 2002.", the term 'inflammatory pseudotumor' was mentioned repeatedly (page 3 and 5). It makes confusion to the readers.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 83963

Title: Inflammatory myofibroblastic tumor of the distal common bile duct: Literature review with focus on pathological examination

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05226098

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Director, Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: Belgium

Manuscript submission date: 2023-02-17

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-05-15 11:48

Reviewer performed review: 2023-05-16 05:42

Review time: 17 Hours

	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C:
Scientific quality	Good
	[Y] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair
this manuscript	[] Grade D: No creativity or innovation



Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No scientific significance
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) [] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[]Yes [Y]No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Please add the clinical features (age, gender, biliopancreatic site, tumor size, etc.), diagnostic method and prognosis of inflammatory myofibroblastic tumor.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 83963

Title: Inflammatory myofibroblastic tumor of the distal common bile duct: Literature review with focus on pathological examination

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 00038995

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: FAASLD, MD, PhD

Professional title: Adjunct Professor, Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: Belgium

Manuscript submission date: 2023-02-17

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-05-15 20:37

Reviewer performed review: 2023-05-16 22:02

Review time: 1 Day and 1 Hour

	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C:
Scientific quality	Good
	[] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair
this manuscript	[] Grade D: No creativity or innovation



Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	 [] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	 [] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [] Anonymous [Y] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I enjoyed reading this comprehensive discussion of pancreatic IMT. I have dealt for years as a gastroenterologist with pancreatic tumors in academic centers and agree with the rarity. I do not have major issues with the written text as such, but I find that it is a little too much written for a highly specialized audience and frankly more for a pathological journal. Difficult for this reviewer to understand all different details of testing I would suggest to respect to very variable background of the readership. Help them a little more and outline a perspective somewhat clearer. It could start with a somewhat more simple clinical perspective like "The current armamentarium available in the diagnosis of pancreatic and biliary tract diseases enables increasingly to obtain histological tissue samples inconsideration of the increasingly broad differential diagnosis of benign and malignant tumors. Whereas features of lesions such as IgG4 mediated inflammation have increasingly recognized as imitators of malignancies, other entities can now sometimes at an early stage be recognized and may have important treatment implications. We present a case of....... I would suggest in the abstract the hallmarks of the diagnoses. The article discusses a major number of markers etc. It



would help the reader to have simple figure/flow diagram or whatever as a summary. Finally: The authors emphasize the importance of the absence or presence of markers. Please be a little more specific: what is speculation, and what has as yet been demonstrated to be true with respect to therapeutic implications? Finally: It is an update: what specifically is different or new today compared to 10 years ago?



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 83963

Title: Inflammatory myofibroblastic tumor of the distal common bile duct: Literature review with focus on pathological examination

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03257024

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Australia

Author's Country/Territory: Belgium

Manuscript submission date: 2023-02-17

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-05-06 06:59

Reviewer performed review: 2023-05-17 01:59

Review time: 10 Days and 19 Hours

	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C:
Scientific quality	Good
	[] Grade D: Fair [Y] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair
this manuscript	[Y] Grade D: No creativity or innovation



Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No scientific significance
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) [] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This manuscript describes a case of rare disease entity, namely an inflammatory myofibroblastic tumour within the distal bile duct, with a detailed, predominantly pathological literature review of this condition. Whilst there are merits in publishing case reports of rare disease entities, this manuscript places heavy emphasis on the histopathological aspects. The case description itself lacks clinical focus, and it was unclear whether this was of biliary or pancreatic origin. Much more detail needs to be included regarding the clinical aspects of the case, and less detail on the pathological aspects.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 83963

Title: Inflammatory myofibroblastic tumor of the distal common bile duct: Literature review with focus on pathological examination

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02860895

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: DSc, MD

Professional title: Chief Doctor, Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: Belgium

Manuscript submission date: 2023-02-17

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-05-15 10:21

Reviewer performed review: 2023-05-22 02:42

Review time: 6 Days and 16 Hours

	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C:
Scientific quality	Good
	[] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair
this manuscript	[] Grade D: No creativity or innovation



Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No scientific significance
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) [] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[]Yes [Y]No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an important report that focuses on the inflammatory myofibroblastic tumor of the pancreaticobiliary region. The authors not only presented their own case but also shared the latest knowledge on the subject. I truly value this paper as a remarkable piece of work, but I find it incongruous to categorize it as a review article. In my understanding, it is more suitable to be formatted as a case report. Therefore, I suggest that the authors revise the format accordingly and resubmit it to the journal.