

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 6708

Title: Solid pseudopapillary tumor of pancreas in male patients: report of 16 cases.

Reviewer code: 02730766

Science editor: Wen, Ling-Ling

Date sent for review: 2013-10-28 14:19

Date reviewed: 2013-11-24 21:27

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

Title accurately reflects the major topic and contents of the study. Abstract gives a clear delineation of the research background, objectives, materials and methods, results (including important data) and conclusions. Methods used are innovative and advanced. Detailed description is provided to allow other investigators to reproduce or validate authors' findings. Results provide sufficient evidence to draw firm scientific conclusions. Sample size and statistical data, especially graphic data, are adequate for a clinical study. Discussion is well organized, and provides systematic theoretical analyses and valuable conclusions. References are appropriate, relevant, and updated.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 6708

Title: Solid pseudopapillary tumor of pancreas in male patients: report of 16 cases.

Reviewer code: 00028941

Science editor: Wen, Ling-Ling

Date sent for review: 2013-10-28 14:19

Date reviewed: 2013-12-28 10:11

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

The authors demonstrated that male patients with SPT were elder than the female patients, and that there was no significant difference between male patients and female patients regarding surgical strategies and prognosis. This study is contradictory to the previous report that the SPT with male patients were more aggressive and needed more radical surgery. This study was based on comparatively large sample and very informative. Minor 1. Please correct the sentence. P5 in line 7, followed by pancreatic head 2. Figure 3 should be omitted.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 6708

Title: Solid pseudopapillary tumor of pancreas in male patients: report of 16 cases.

Reviewer code: 00077138

Science editor: Wen, Ling-Ling

Date sent for review: 2013-10-28 14:19

Date reviewed: 2013-12-30 10:47

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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a single institution case series of a reasonable number of SPT over 10 years. The language needs to be corrected for grammar and phrasing. The proportion of male SPTs in this series is consistent with the observation of 10% of SPTs being in male and does not present any new findings. The management plan stated that a more aggressive approach was taken for the male patients in this series but there is no specific guidelines on when aggressive approach is taken for the female patients as the risk of malignancy seems to be similar for both gender groups and size alone is not a predictive criteria.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 6708

Title: Solid pseudopapillary tumor of pancreas in male patients: report of 16 cases.

Reviewer code: 00503773

Science editor: Wen, Ling-Ling

Date sent for review: 2013-10-28 14:19

Date reviewed: 2013-12-31 00:26

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" 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)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I read the manuscript named "Solid pseudopapillary tumor of pancreas in male patients: report of 16 cases" (ESPS Manuscript NO: 6708) and my recommendations are as follows. Title: It is accurately reflects the major topic and contents of the study. Abstract: Adequate, summarizing the topic. Methods: Convenient with the purpose of the study. Discussion: Topics has been discussed with all aspects. References are appropriate, relevant, and updated. Tables and figures are reflects the major findings of the study, and they are appropriately presented. This study is clearly presented. Except for the limitations including the retrospective study and the relative small sample size in male group, the study was well-written and documented. Also, this manuscript gives additional new knowledge to the literature. I think that this manuscript is suitable and worth to be published in World Journal of Gastroenterology.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 6708

Title: Solid pseudopapillary tumor of pancreas in male patients: report of 16 cases.

Reviewer code: 00722239

Science editor: Wen, Ling-Ling

Date sent for review: 2013-10-28 14:19

Date reviewed: 2014-01-04 11:31

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

The authors have reported 116 cases of SPT of pancreas involving 16 male cases. They documented the clinical, radiological and pathological features of SPT comparing with female and male cases and concluded that there was no significant difference between male patients and female patients without patient's age. Considering the rarity of SPT of pancreas, especially male cases, this study is interesting and valuable. My opinion is that this manuscript is acceptable after minor English polishing.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 6708

Title: Solid pseudopapillary tumor of pancreas in male patients: report of 16 cases.

Reviewer code: 02839945

Science editor: Wen, Ling-Ling

Date sent for review: 2013-10-28 14:19

Date reviewed: 2014-01-05 00:45

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	[] Rejection
[] Grade D (Fair)	[] Grade D: rejected	BPG Search:	[] Minor revision
[] Grade E (Poor)		[] Existed	[] Major revision
		[] No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This manuscript details a very large single center experience in the management of solid pseudopapillary tumors (SPT) of the pancreas over a 10 year time period. The authors compared the presentation and outcomes for males versus females as well as benign versus malignant SPT. The data is very clearly and concisely presented and the manuscript is written very well. The data contained in the center's experience is the largest in the world and definitely adds value to the literature regarding what is currently known about this rare pancreatic neoplasm. I would highly recommend publication. The only minor points that I would add would be: 1. Provide standard definitions in the methods section for the results presented in the manuscript (e.g. Clavien classification system for morbidity, 30-day vs. 90-day mortality, ISPGS consensus definitions for pancreatic fistula). 2. The "organ-preserving" concept is not standard. Almost all pancreatic operations are on some level an "organ-preserving" operation. To separate these operations out in the results and in Table 2 is slightly unclear. However, the authors are correct to point out in the discussion that less-than-radical operations are sufficient for this mostly benign neoplastic process. 3. In Materials and Methods & table 2, I would just call the 2 groups "male" and "female" instead of Group 1 and Group 2.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 6708

Title: Solid pseudopapillary tumor of pancreas in male patients: report of 16 cases.

Reviewer code: 00503542

Science editor: Wen, Ling-Ling

Date sent for review: 2013-10-28 14:19

Date reviewed: 2014-01-07 12:33

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

This manuscript summarizes 116 surgical cases (16 male and 100 female cases) of solid pseudopapillary tumor (SPT) of pancreas and analyses difference between male and female cases. The number of collected cases is large for this rather rare disease and the conclusion seems reasonable. However, there are some problems as follows. 1. As to the location of the tumors in Tab. 1, 23 (approx. 20%) cases are in the neck and only 8 (approx. 7%) cases are in the body and tail. However, according to Gray's Anatomy of the Human Body, for example, "It (Pancreas) is long and irregularly prismatic in shape; its right extremity, being broad, is called the head, and is connected to the main portion of the organ, or body, by a slight constriction, the neck; while its left extremity gradually tapers to form the tail." So, the neck should be a small portion of the pancreas. What is the authors' definition of pancreatic neck? Seemingly, these data need reconsideration based on authorized reference of pancreatic anatomy. 2. There are typos and confusing words. For example, "using the nonparametric the Student's t test, ---" (page 4), "pancreatic head (7 cases, 43.7%), followed by pancreatic head (5 cases, 31.3%),---" (page 5), "a1-antitrypsin" (page 8) in which "a" should be alpha in Greek letter, "In the group 1, thirty-one patients (31%) manifested at least one of the biological behaviors listed above. There were 4 patients (25%) who suffered from malignant SPT." (page 8) in which "In the group 2" is needed in the second sentence. 3. A few interesting cases may need more description. For example, one unresectable case (page 9) may need the reason for unresectability. One multiple SPT case may need more description and discussion. 4. As the authors mentioned in the manuscript, a major problem of SPT is accuracy of its diagnosis. For example, endocrine tumor with central necrosis may be misdiagnosed as a small SPT. So, the question is, How



Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited

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

accurate are the authors' diagnosis? 5. Among many articles of SPT, Huang HL, Shih SC, Chang WH, Wang TE, Chen MJ, Chan YJ. Solid-pseudopapillary tumor of the pancreas: clinical experience and literature review. *World J Gastroenterol*. 2005 Mar 7;11(9):1403-9. may be included in the references. 6. English needs improvement.