

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 16848

**Title:** MANAGEMENT OF AMPULLARY NEOPLASMS: A TAILORED APPROACH BETWEEN ENDOSCOPY AND SURGERY

**Reviewer's code:** 00058511

**Reviewer's country:** Greece

**Science editor:** Yuan Qi

**Date sent for review:** 2015-01-30 10:47

**Date reviewed:** 2015-02-20 14:44

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

It is a well-written comprehensive review article on an interesting topic of ampullary neoplasms.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 16848

**Title:** MANAGEMENT OF AMPULLARY NEOPLASMS: A TAILORED APPROACH BETWEEN ENDOSCOPY AND SURGERY

**Reviewer's code:** 02445447

**Reviewer's country:** Bulgaria

**Science editor:** Yuan Qi

**Date sent for review:** 2015-01-30 10:47

**Date reviewed:** 2015-02-23 07:26

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Excellent work with clear conclusions, based on comprehensive review of the literature. Very good visualization of the analyzed data. A scientific work, ready for publishing.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 16848

**Title:** MANAGEMENT OF AMPULLARY NEOPLASMS: A TAILORED APPROACH BETWEEN ENDOSCOPY AND SURGERY

**Reviewer's code:** 00505458

**Reviewer's country:** Germany

**Science editor:** Yuan Qi

**Date sent for review:** 2015-01-30 10:47

**Date reviewed:** 2015-02-12 18:09

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this extensive summary of our current knowledge the authors mention the importance of histology, in particularly the separation of intestinal from pancreatobiliary type. However, many tumors showed a mixed composition with various gradings, and the pathological assessment may not be very clear. Taking all the other factors that are assumed to have an impact on prognosis (stage, surgical resection, co-morbidities, adjuvant treatments) and considering the small cohorts of patients with this rare disease, the overall evidence is not as high as indicated by the many data. Thus it is just fair to underline the many limitations of our "knowledge". The differences in the prognosis of these patients may rather reflect these uncertainties than a progress in therapies.