

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 6941

Title: Pancreatic Ductal Adenocarcinoma: Risk Factors, Screening, & Early Detection

Reviewer code: 02788999

Science editor: Zhai, Huan-Huan

Date sent for review: 2013-11-01 11:55

Date reviewed: 2013-11-27 05:40

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	[] Existed	[] Minor revision
[] Grade E (Poor)		[] No records	[] Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear authors, This is a very well written manuscript which summarizes current knowledge of risk factors and screening possibilities for early detection of pancreatic cancer. I have only some minor suggestions, which you may disregard if you don't agree. Comments/suggestions: 1. First reference, line 4 of the introduction: I suspect this reference is incorrect. I cannot information of expected cancer-related death by 2050 in the referenced article. 2. Some typographical or language "errors": - Introduction, second paragraph, line 6, "Peutz-Jeghers" should be followed by "syndrome". - Page 15, paragraph with subtitle "Pancreatic Intraepithelial Neoplasm (PanIN), fifth line, "as well as an increased number of high-grade PanIN lesions compared to low-grade" might be rephrased to "as well as an increased number of high-grade compared to low-grade PanIN lesions". - Page 18, second line from below (in the second paragraph subtitled "Current Screening Guidelines), there is a number 3 missing: "(e) patients with ≥ 3 FDR ..." - Page 19, third line from below, end of line, "a" should be "an" (i.e., "an FDR" in stead of "a FDR") - Page 12, paragraph subtitled "Diabetes Mellitus ...", second sentence, the phrase "25-50% of patients will be diagnosed with DM within 3 years of their pancreatic cancer": Is this really what you meant to say? 3. If there is one section I feel might need to be rewritten, it is the concluding summary. In my opinion, this paragraph is not so informative. In particular, the last sentence could be rephrased ("inform efforts to" might be omitted or substituted with "help to"). However, I would much rather see this summary elaborating a little more on what might be learnt from reading this summary. Alternatively, a summary box might be included to summarize even more explicitly (1) recent advances (previous 3 years) in knowledge about risk factors and early detection in pancreatic cancer, (2) the reasons why screening is difficult in pancreatic cancer (e.g., prevalence and high-risk-identification considerations, diagnostic harm vs



Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited

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

yield), and (3) anticipated future advances and screening possibilities. Yours sincerely, Arne Westgaard