



ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 29840

Title: Non-functioning pancreatic neuroendocrine tumors: Surgery or observation?

Reviewer’s code: 00699087

Reviewer’s country: Japan

Science editor: Jin-Xin Kong

Date sent for review: 2016-08-30 08:20

Date reviewed: 2016-09-14 21:56

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 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"/> No	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Re: manuscript “Non-functioning pancreatic neuroendocrine tumors –Surgery or observation?”
 Authors: Bar-Moshe Y, et al. This review manuscript describes the details of recent controversy in management of incidentally found small non-functioning neuroendocrine tumors. The authors described pros and cons on this issue, by referring many papers. Although they could not draw the definitive conclusion, this paper is well-written and introduces a lot of information regarding in this field. I believe this manuscript is worth for publication in World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy. Below are several minor points which authors should be considered. Introduction first paragraph As they described in the later text, neuroendocrine tumors are divided into two groups of functional and non-functional depending on the existence of symptoms caused by hormonal hypersecretion, not only by the ability of hormones and peptides hypersecretion. The text of 4th line of Introduction should be changed. It should be good if they refer WHO classification (reference 37). Imaging 2nd line: duo → due Grading and Staging In WHO classification 2010, several terms which used in WHO classification 2000 was disappeared, such as well differentiated neuroendocrine tumor and poorly differentiated neuroendocrine carcinoma. They should take out these words from line 4-5



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>

of this paragraph. Also, the criteria of Grade 1 Ki-67 is $\leq 2\%$, not $< 2\%$. 2nd paragraph of Grading and staging For readers better understanding, they should describe more details of the differences between AJCC and ENETS staging system, especially focusing on difference between T3 and T4. Reference 37: Please confirm the author name.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 29840

Title: Non-functioning pancreatic neuroendocrine tumors: Surgery or observation?

Reviewer's code: 00077678

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Jin-Xin Kong

Date sent for review: 2016-08-30 08:20

Date reviewed: 2016-09-01 03:09

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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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

This is nice review on an increasing important clinical question: small non-functioning PNETs. Some revisions will make it stronger. Page 4. Please add the 5th hereditary pancreatic neuroendocrine tumor syndrome (Mahvash disease). There are a few reviews on this condition (e.g. Mahvash disease: an autosomal recessive hereditary pancreatic neuroendocrine tumor syndrome. International Journal of Endocrine Oncology 2016). Page 6. Please add that pancreatic polypeptide can be false positive due to eating and renal insufficiency. Page 9. A recent paper on small pancreatic lesions is very illustrative for the etiology of small pancreatic masses (Differential diagnosis of small solid pancreatic lesions. Gastrointest Endosc 2016) and add perspective to clinicians. Please discuss this paper. Page 13. An algorithm (as a figure) starting with a small pancreatic mass will be very important to summarize the review's main points. Currently the roles of biopsy is not obvious in the workup of a small pancreatic mass.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 29840

Title: Non-functioning pancreatic neuroendocrine tumors: Surgery or observation?

Reviewer's code: 03334983

Reviewer's country: Ireland

Science editor: Jin-Xin Kong

Date sent for review: 2016-08-30 08:20

Date reviewed: 2016-09-09 20:55

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors have reviewed in a pretty general fashion the issue of non-functioning pancreatic neuroendocrine tumors (pNET). Indeed the topic is interesting and the current discussion on that among the experts is hot enough at the moment, however it appears to me that unfortunately this review does not focus in a very specific way on the main topic as per the title while it rather covers the topic "non-functioning pNET" in a broadest way. I think that such cut affects the manuscript, which might gain value if focusing in a more targeted fashion on the title issue. For example, the sections on diagnosis and grading / staging are pretty long and may distract the reader from the focus on the operative vs observational approach to non-functioning pNET. Moreover, there is a number of inaccuracies here and there along the manuscript which may give the impression of superficiality. For example, page 7, lines 11-12 reports an incorrect sentence since the WHO 2010 classification is actually considered carrying a prognostic value. In Table 1, there is a mix up between staging and grading. There are also some language and editorial inaccuracies which affect the manuscript. With that regard, for example, I suggest to avoid the use of abbreviations in Abstract and Core Tip and the authors should use always abbreviation already specified in the text, defining the



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>

acronym at the time of their first appearance. Moreover there are a few typos and bibliographic inaccuracies as well (for example, page 7, line 9; page 12, line 15). I suggest the authors to consider a exhaustive and careful revision of the manuscript with the primary goal of striking in a more compelling way the target as per the chosen title and avoiding spending too much space for a general and not particularly attractive overview on non-functioning pNET.