

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 22184

**Title:** Chronic pancreatitis: A diagnostic dilemma

**Reviewer's code:** 02445866

**Reviewer's country:** Lithuania

**Science editor:** Jing Yu

**Date sent for review:** 2015-08-19 19:49

**Date reviewed:** 2015-10-01 02:04

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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

A nicely designed and perfectly drafted review, presenting novel interpretation of known data. I would suggest enhancing quality of the figures 5 and 6.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 22184

**Title:** Chronic pancreatitis: A diagnostic dilemma

**Reviewer's code:** 01799726

**Reviewer's country:** China

**Science editor:** Jing Yu

**Date sent for review:** 2015-08-19 19:49

**Date reviewed:** 2015-10-01 14:34

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> 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 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

The non-specific symptom and sign, as well as vague findings by imaging tools and functional tests, make the diagnosis of chronic pancreatitis become difficult, especially at its early stage. Though the incidence is increasing in most countries, the diagnostic standard has not been reached. In this manuscript, the authors reviewed the now available diagnostic tools and questioned the known concept that steatorrhea only occurs with >90% destruction of the gland. The review is helpful for physicians who puzzled in diagnosis and treatment of chronic pancreatitis for the disease is rarely for each of them. For my opinion, there are three items should be discussed. 1. It is better to discuss the novel diagnostic techniques more for these techniques are promising and attractive to deal with the diagnostic problem. 2. The statement of "steatorrhea only occurs with >90% destruction of the gland" is rarely mentioned now for the concept was proposed in 1970's and 80's from poor diagnostic tool at that time. In this review, the main objective is to discuss the newly development techniques of pancreatic diagnosis, so the deduced space is better. 3. In line 12-13 page 8 (In 2010, the Japanese clinical diagnostic.....), we can see the number 1,2,3,4,6....., and 5 is not here.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 22184

**Title:** Chronic pancreatitis: A diagnostic dilemma

**Reviewer's code:** 00181445

**Reviewer's country:** China

**Science editor:** Jing Yu

**Date sent for review:** 2015-08-19 19:49

**Date reviewed:** 2015-10-18 20:39

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" 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 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 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	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1-The language should be American English, not British English, or according to the Author guidelines. 2-CT/MRCP and ERCP are most used methods in clinical practice, therefore should be emphasized in details. 3-Pancreatic function tests are very important for diagnosis of chronic pancreatitis. The authors summarized the methods of pancreatic function test, but they did not discuss why these methods are not widely used in clinical practice, especially the direct testing methods.