

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 4850

Title: Quantification of pancreatic exocrine function of chronic pancreatitis with secretin-enhanced MRCP

Reviewer code: 00036023

Science editor: Wang, Jin-Lei

Date sent for review: 2013-07-29 17:40

Date reviewed: 2013-08-10 01:08

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"/> 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 TO AUTHORS

Interesting paper on the use of secretin MRCP for assessment of pancreatic function. The methodology is sound and there is no reason to doubt the statistical analyses. The text needs editing as there are numerous spelling and grammatical errors.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 4850

Title: Quantification of pancreatic exocrine function of chronic pancreatitis with secretin-enhanced MRCP

Reviewer code: 00200804

Science editor: Wang, Jin-Lei

Date sent for review: 2013-07-29 17:40

Date reviewed: 2013-08-13 10:16

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 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 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 TO AUTHORS

The manuscript describes the quantitative evaluation of MRCP over 10 minutes after secretin administration in a case control study. Although the study is well designed, I would like to invite the authors to revise the manuscript, keeping into consideration the following points: - Why the authors did not use "secretin cerulein test" as the gold standard? - What were the criteria for the diagnosis of chronic pancreatitis in the study population? - The manuscript suffers from numerous grammatical and spelling errors, which needs a thorough linguistic revision. - The abstract section is too long, particularly in the results section. - What is the "SMRCP" abbreviation for? Abbreviations should be described in full at their first appearance in the text. - There are a number of recent publications in the field that can be used by the authors to augment the discussion section, such as: "Assessment of exocrine pancreatic function by secretin-stimulated magnetic resonance cholangiopancreatography and diffusion-weighted imaging in healthy controls. J Magn Reson Imaging". - It is not clear how many patients had mild, moderate, and severe chronic pancreatitis. Please provide the exact numbers for each group, early in the result section. - Why all numbers in the result section are presented in parenthesis? - There are multiple duplication of presentation of information in tables and the main text. Please avoid repeating the information presented in the form of figures and tables in the main text. - As I mentioned earlier, the references are outdated. There are multiple recent publications in the field which needs to be considered in redrafting the discussion section. - The discussion section is very poor. First of all, I would like to invite the authors to start with what they have found in their study. Then they need to compare their study findings with the recent reports on the MRCP evaluation of pancreatic function. At the end they can emphasize on the



Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited

Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,
315-321 Lockhart Road,
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

strengths and weaknesses of their study. The current format of the discussion needs a thorough revision. - There is no conclusion from the study.