

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 19431

**Title:** Endoscopic ultrasound-guided ethanol ablation of pancreatic neuroendocrine tumours: A case study and literature review

**Reviewer's code:** 02543890

**Reviewer's country:** Lebanon

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2015-05-11 15:07

**Date reviewed:** 2015-06-19 00:40

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 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 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 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 well written paper having a clear endpoint and objectives . The review of the literature is complete and presented in an attractive way . My only comment will be to restructure and modify the introduction , which is comparable to all the papers discussing NETs .

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 19431

**Title:** Endoscopic ultrasound-guided ethanol ablation of pancreatic neuroendocrine tumours: A case study and literature review

**Reviewer's code:** 00030205

**Reviewer's country:** Sweden

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2015-05-11 15:07

**Date reviewed:** 2015-05-19 06:54

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 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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

Interesting case but not very much new information.