
ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Ms: 1973

Title: EUS elastography for the differentiation of pancreatic adenocarcinoma and inflammatory masses: A meta-analysis

Reviewer code: 00503444

Science editor: l.l.wen@wjgnet.com

Date sent for review: 2013-01-17 19:22

Date reviewed: 2013-01-21 15:25

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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS

CONFIDENTIAL COMMENTS TO EDITOR:

The paper has many methodological flaws

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS:

The authors aimed to evaluate the accuracy of EUS elastography for differentiation of pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma (PDAC) and pancreatic inflammatory mass (PIM) by using a meta-analysis approach; they concluded that EUS elastography is a promising noninvasive method for differential diagnosis of PDAC and PIM and may prove to be a valuable supplemental method to EUS-FNA. Major comments 1. It is quite surprising that the authors stated that they excluded studies without complete data available and considered data presented as abstracts where the data are not fully available. 2. They should also explain why they not used MESH terms in searching the papers in Medline/PubMed. 3. The authors also stated that if there was any missing data needed, they required the missing data from authors by mail. However, they should clearly report how many authors were contacted for data missed and how many authors answered to the request. 4. The data of the 10 papers considered should be calculated also without taking into account the data presented as abstract. 5. Why about the SRoc? Minor comment 1. Please capitalize spearman. 2. The authors of reference 21 should be reported according to the standard of WJG.. 3. There are several misspelling throughout the text that should be corrected.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Ms: 1973

Title: EUS elastography for the differentiation of pancreatic adenocarcinoma and inflammatory masses: A meta-analysis

Reviewer code: 00001390

Science editor: l.l.wen@wjgnet.com

Date sent for review: 2013-01-17 19:22

Date reviewed: 2013-02-01 17:58

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)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS

CONFIDENTIAL COMMENTS TO EDITOR:

Authors carried out meta-analysis of EUS elastography for the differentiation between pancreatic adenocarcinoma and inflammatory masses. They concluded that EUS elastography is a promising noninvasive method and may prove to be a valuable supplemental method to EUS-FNA. I agree to authors conclusion that as an image method with moderate specificity, EUS elastography could hardly replace EUS-FNA which could provide a pathological diagnosis, however, it could be a valuable supplemental method to EUS-FNA.

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS:

Authors carried out meta-analysis of EUS elastography for the differentiation between pancreatic adenocarcinoma and inflammatory masses. They concluded that EUS elastography is a promising noninvasive method and may prove to be a valuable supplemental method to EUS-FNA. 1. I agree to authors conclusion that as an image method with moderate specificity, EUS elastography could hardly replace EUS-FNA which could provide a pathological diagnosis, however, it could be a valuable supplemental method to EUS-FNA. 2. Autoimmune pancreatitis is recently recognized inflammatory mass of pancreas which should be differentiated from pancreatic cancer. In this meta-analysis, the differentiation between pancreatic cancer and autoimmune pancreatitis was included? 3. Pancreatic inflammatory mass may include variety of diseases with heterogeneous EUS elastography results?



Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited

Room 903, Building D, Ocean International Center,
No.62 Dongsihuan Zhonglu, Chaoyang District, Beijing 100025, China
Telephone: +86-10-8538-1892 Fax: +86-10-8538-1893
E-mail: bpg@baishideng.com http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Ms: 1973

Title: EUS elastography for the differentiation of pancreatic adenocarcinoma and inflammatory masses: A meta-analysis

Reviewer code: 00003940

Science editor: l.l.wen@wjgnet.com

Date sent for review: 2013-01-17 19:22

Date reviewed: 2013-02-05 20:09

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> [] High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] 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	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> [] Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> [] No records	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Major revision

COMMENTS

CONFIDENTIAL COMMENTS TO EDITOR:

I am not an expert on Meta-analysis but I think this has been well researched and presented. I think it is a reasonable question to address and the results have value.

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS:

Some minor language issues but otherwise the paper is easy to read.