

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 25859

Title: Early stage pancreatic cancer – what determines outcome?

Reviewer's code: 00001832

Reviewer's country: Germany

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2016-03-25 16:00

Date reviewed: 2016-04-20 19:56

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 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 checked="" 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

The manuscript by ?kerberg and coworkers reviews prognostic factors in early stage pancreatic cancer. The manuscript is –in general- well written and the topic is timely and of interest. There are a few points to consider: ? Regarding lymph node status: there are obviously different approaches to lymphadenectomy in pancreatic cancer. Do the authors have any information regarding this for the included studies? ? Regarding R0/R1 status: there are obviously different protocols and definitions of involved resection margins in pancreatic cancer. Do the authors have any information regarding this for the included studies? ? I certainly agree with the authors' conclusion that a unifying way of reporting data on prognostic factors should be used in the future. I would also like the authors to include statements regarding unifying ways of therapy and acquiring data. For example, the international study group for pancreatic surgery has made efforts to define standard (and extended) lymphadenectomy for pancreatic cancer, which are now widely accepted. In contrast, histopathological reporting is still defined differently in various national guidelines. Further, to the best of my knowledge, there is no uniform definition of how to evaluate perineural or perivascular invasion. Indeed, some pathologists would argue that you would find that in close to 100% of cases, if



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

you look hard enough.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 25859

Title: Early stage pancreatic cancer – what determines outcome?

Reviewer's code: 00068107

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2016-03-25 16:00

Date reviewed: 2016-05-02 11:12

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 checked="" 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 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		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

No

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 25859

Title: Early stage pancreatic cancer – what determines outcome?

Reviewer's code: 01191922

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2016-03-25 16:00

Date reviewed: 2016-05-05 17:52

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"/> 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This review by Akerberg D, et al. discussed the impact of conventional prognostic factors on survival of early stage pancreatic cancer. The manuscript is well-written. Several comments are listed below. 1. The title focused on early stage pancreatic cancer, while the context discussed resectable PDAC. The main concern is that resectable PDAC does not equal to early stage pancreatic cancer. 2. Although pancreatic tumors include a wide range of histopathologic subtypes, distal bile duct, duodenum and ampulla of Vater are actually not belong to these tumors. Pancreatic cancers include exocrine and neuroendocrine tumors, and solid pseudopapillary carcinomas, et al. This review mainly focused on PDAC. Thus, the title maybe more appropriate if pancreatic cancer is changed as PDAC. 3. This study included five conventional prognostic factors, however, tumor location, tumor grade and CA19-9 level are as important as these factors. Why did the authors select these factors? 4. The systematic reviews may omit several studies. For example, a total of 14 studies were identified about vascular involvement and survival. A recent meta-analysis published in British Journal of Surgery included 27 studies comparing the results of PV/SMV resection (+) with those of PV/SMV resection (-) during pancreatic resection. 5. In table 3, the first two studies are duplicated. In line Kelly [82], "R1+" should



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

be "R1".