

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 32384

**Title:** Comparison of endoscopic ultrasound, computed tomography and magnetic resonance imaging for pancreatic cystic neoplasms' detailed structures

**Reviewer's code:** 02856139

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Jin-Lei Wang

**Date sent for review:** 2017-01-05 11:32

**Date reviewed:** 2017-01-20 17:17

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

This is an interesting manuscript. After some minor language revision, it can be published in the journal.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 32384

**Title:** Comparison of endoscopic ultrasound, computed tomography and magnetic resonance imaging for pancreatic cystic neoplasms' detailed structures

**Reviewer's code:** 02857047

**Reviewer's country:** Greece

**Science editor:** Jin-Lei Wang

**Date sent for review:** 2017-01-05 11:32

**Date reviewed:** 2017-01-25 17:37

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

This is an interesting manuscript. This study evaluated the advantages of EUS in the assessment of pancreatic cystic neoplasms in detailed structures compared with CT and MRI. A total of 52 females and 16 males were evaluated. The median size of the cysts was 42.5 mm by EUS; there was no significant difference in size as assessed by CT and MRI. The detection rate of the septum by EUS was higher than by CT; this difference between EUS and CT was significant ( $p=0.02$ ). The rate of visualizing the pancreatic duct with EUS was 100%, while CT and MRI were less than 10%. Over all, this study is well designed. The results are very interesting. After some minor revision of the language, it can be accepted for publication.