

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 16464

Title: Impact of clinical pathway on treatment outcome in patients with acute pancreatitis

Reviewer's code: 03260142

Reviewer's country: Turkey

Science editor: Jing Yu

Date sent for review: 2015-01-30 10:23

Date reviewed: 2015-03-26 05:11

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input checked="" 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"/> 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		[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 is a interesting and valuable multicenter study related to the Acute pancreatitis and impact of clinical pathway.

However, the definition of severe and modaretely severe, mild pancreatitis was different from.

Authors must classified acute pancreatitis according new updated Atlanta criteria. Therefore the results may different from previous study.

Authors must correct abstract or write again (Background and conclusion too short and Results and Discussion too long)

Statistics should be reperformed according to original definition of abnormal grade of updated Atlanta criteria.

Another problem is the organization of tables. Readers may get confused by the expression of group.

The discussion section of the manuscript is too long and repeat same things.