

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 16651

Title: Current status and progress of pancreatic cancer in China

Reviewer's code: 02445450

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2015-01-27 08:50

Date reviewed: 2015-02-11 11:22

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This editorial is very interesting, because it statistically describes the condition of Chinese pancreatic cancers from page 2-6. Compared with these statistical comments, descriptions about risk factors and screening of early pancreatic cancer may look threadless. First, the author shows a)-h) individuals as high-risk patients without any comments on consensus and/or references. Second, a)-h) include intraductal papillary mucinous neoplasms and FAP, while the paragraph 'Other risk factors' does not contain any genetic pancreatic cancers and pancreatic cystic lesions. In the first paragraph of 'Diagnosis', the author shows % numbers of patients diagnosed at stage I/II and III/IV. If the author shows the comparison of these values with other countries like the US, it may be more interesting. In the last line of page 9, the author says that EUS has been widely used in detection of pancreatic cancer in recent years. However, in the paragraph starting from line 9 on the same page, the author says that EUS was performed for only 5.7% of patients to detect pancreatic cancer. And the results of EUS are susceptible to the doctor's experience. These two parts sound to be opposed to each other, so the author may be better to describe consistent comments on EUS. I could not understand why the author comments on liver metastasis after colorectal cancer surgery (ref 75).

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 16651

Title: Current status and progress of pancreatic cancer in China

Reviewer's code: 02445433

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2015-01-27 08:50

Date reviewed: 2015-02-02 18:53

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	<input 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"/> 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"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The paper is interesting as it analyzes the pancreatic cancer incidence and mortality rising in China. To improve the potential interest for readers of WJG, I recommend that the review is divided in sections and subsections (i.e.: 1.Epidemiology worldwide, 1.a Epidemiology in China; 2. Risk factors 2.a Tobacco, etc.; 3. Screening, 3.a molecular markers, 3.b. Imaging; 4. Diagnosis; 5. Therapy, 5.a Surgery, 5.b Chemotherapy and targeted therapy, 5.c Radiation therapy; 5d. Traditional Chinese medicine; 6.Pancreatic cancer research in China; 7. Challenge and future direction). Moreover, other substantial criticisms are: 1) The screening potential of imaging should be described in more clinical details; 2) In the clinical studies described, the number of patients analyzed in the trials should be reported (number of treated patients versus number of positive or negative patient outcomes) . 3) Some minor English language mistakes were recorded.