



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology
Manuscript NO: 35870
Title: Role of Endoscopic Ultrasound in Idiopathic Pancreatitis
Reviewer’s code: 02454185
Reviewer’s country: China
Science editor: Ke Chen
Date sent for review: 2017-08-13
Date reviewed: 2017-08-13

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"/> 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 checked="" 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 is a review paper describing the diagnostic performance of EUS for idiopathic pancreatitis. I have several comments for the authors to improve the manuscript. 1. in the section “WHAT IS IDIOPATHIC PANCREATITIS?”, there is a confusion on IAP and RAP. Furthermore, the definition “After a complete additional advanced work-up, the aetiology remains unknown in no more than 10% of RAP, which can then be defined as true IRAP” is ambiguous in that the advanced work-up is not fully defined and can be varied substantially across hospitals and regions. 2. “In a recent systemic review of 13 studies evaluating the role of EUS in IAP, the most frequent aetiology was biliary tract disease (biliary stones, microlithiasis and sludge).”---were other diagnostic modalities also reported for the diagnostic accuracy? What is the reference standard? 3. “Various studies on the sensitivity of EUS to detect biliary tract disease suggests that EUS has superior sensitivity to other commonly used tests like ultrasonography(USG), CT, MRCP or MBE”: there needs a table summarizing these findings, reporting sensitivity,



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

specificity, AUC and reference standard for EUS. 4. in the section "EUS versus ERCP in idiopathic pancreatitis", the authors reported RAP. And for IAP, the authors primarily focused on the ERCP and MRCP for their diagnostic accuracy. 5. "The sensitivity of EUS was 86.7%, significantly higher than CT (15.5%) or MRCP (60%)." ---these statistics cannot reflect the diagnostic accuracy of EUS, the sensitivity and specificity are balanced statistics. You need to report the AUC to compare diagnostic tools.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology
Manuscript NO: 35870
Title: Role of Endoscopic Ultrasound in Idiopathic Pancreatitis
Reviewer’s code: 02941314
Reviewer’s country: China
Science editor: Ke Chen
Date sent for review: 2017-08-13
Date reviewed: 2017-08-21

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"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input checked="" 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 is a review paper evaluating the role of EUS in diagnosing idiopathic pancreatitis. EUS shows superior sensitivity to other commonly used tests. There are some comments for authors to improve this review. 1. Concepts of IAP and RAP are confusing. Authors need to clarify the definition. 2. In section "EUS versus ERCP in idiopathic pancreatitis", authors described the development of ERCP. While the key point should be the comparison between EUS and ERCP in diagnosing idiopathic pancreatitis. 3. In section "EUS versus MRCP in idiopathic pancreatitis", only the comparison of sensitivity of EUS, CT and MRCP is not enough. The AUC is needed for evaluating diagnostic tools.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 35870

Title: Role of Endoscopic Ultrasound in Idiopathic Pancreatitis

Reviewer's code: 03646582

Reviewer's country: Croatia

Science editor: Ke Chen

Date sent for review: 2017-08-13

Date reviewed: 2017-08-21

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] 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 type="checkbox"/> [Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> [] Grade E: Poor		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

The aim of the review is clearly presented The manuscript title is descriptive and interesting enough Conclusions follow from the analysis and discussion References are relevant and up to date there are several typing and word omission errors which need to be corrected in order to clarify the manuscript, especially conclusion