

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 10314

Title: Appropriateness of Systemic Treatments in Unresectable Metastatic Well-Differentiated Pancreatic Neuroendocrine Tumors

Reviewer code: 00068107

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2014-03-26 17:19

Date reviewed: 2014-05-24 18:23

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript has the novelty and innovation for the conclusion that using the RAND/UCLA modified Delphi process, physician experts obtained consensus on the appropriateness of various medical therapies in unresectable metastatic well-differentiated PNETs.

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 10314

Title: Appropriateness of Systemic Treatments in Unresectable Metastatic Well-Differentiated Pancreatic Neuroendocrine Tumors

Reviewer code: 02439777

Science editor: Yuan Qi

Date sent for review: 2014-03-26 17:19

Date reviewed: 2014-05-25 10:57

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

General comments: ? There is nothing new in this review article compared to NCCN guideline or NANETs guideline for W/D PNETs. Since there is not enough evidence for appropriate treatment of metastatic W/D PNETs until now, physicians refer to expert-based recommendation or slightly different guidelines for each country. Authors organized the appropriate treatment based on expert panels; so I would like to say this review article is meaningful. Comments: 1. The well-differentiation PNETs are classified as G1, G2, and G3 based on 2010 WHO classification. However, these terms are not used in this paper. Please explain about this. 2. The well-differentiation PNETs are classified as G1, G2, and G3 based on 2010 WHO classification. However, these terms are not used in this paper. Please explain about this. 3. Authors mentioned only 'appropriate' in the result. It would be great to describe some distinct disagreement in between panels in the discussion.