

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

ESPS manuscript NO: 16694

Title: Pancreaticobiliary reflux as a high-risk factor for biliary malignancy: clinical features and diagnostic advancements.

Reviewer's code: 02860653

Reviewer's country: Ukraine

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2015-01-28 18:30

Date reviewed: 2015-02-11 17:56

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 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 type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input 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

Many mechanisms and diagnostic and therapeutic interventions still are not clarified and should be properly studied and relevant data reviewed. This paper has good novelty is well prepared. However, minor suggests for Authors might improve quality of paper: Despite the importance and well written manuscript the current review seems too brief as a topic is quite well studied so far and many important paper were not cited in the review (e.g., as PMC1312207 - for this reason reference list might be expanded); To include more evidence regarding link of biliary/pancreatic hypertension with malignancies development; To include evidence / discussion regarding Ultrasonography as important imaging modality (with illustrataions); and EUS protocols, including intervettional diagnosis, in vivo imaging, novel advancement etc; Pay more attention to discussion of clinical management; Surgical issues might be reviewed more extensive (e.g. statement `However, some surgeons propose excision of the extrahepatic bile duct together with the gallbladder`); As well the potoperative rehabilitation; Discuss Ultrasoud data and Questionnaires and molecular biomarkers as a potential for screening and Possible measures for prevention. Efforts to suggest a



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>

comprehensive algorithms would be appreciated.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

ESPS manuscript NO: 16694

Title: Pancreaticobiliary reflux as a high-risk factor for biliary malignancy: clinical features and diagnostic advancements.

Reviewer's code: 02733636

Reviewer's country: Turkey

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2015-01-28 18:30

Date reviewed: 2015-02-10 06:35

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 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 type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input 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

Dear Editor, In this manuscript entitled "Pancreaticobiliary reflux as a high-risk factor for biliary malignancy: clinical features and diagnostic advancements" the authors overviewed this subject. In general the information in the paper is adequate for an editorial. However, in most instances references and evidence-based information is lacking. It seems many information is only expert opinion. I suggest a thorough assessment of the text by the authors for this problem. Otherwise it is a well-written manuscript. Several comments and suggestions are provided below. 1. The language used in the manuscript should be improved. 2. The authors state that "...can even cause the expression of carcinogenic substances in the biliary system". Do they have any reference for this information? A clear explanation is needed. 3. "PBR may lead to dilatation of the biliary tree." What is the evidence behind this statement? This seems true but the authors should provide reference. A reference from 1969 may not provide complete information. 4. "Pancreatic juice frequently refluxed into the biliary duct in PBM patients, which results in a high incidence of cancer in the biliary tract. Although PBM patients both with and without choledochal cysts are at risk for biliary



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>

malignancies, both are different in term of the site of malignancy in the biliary tract." Those information requires reference. 5. "Pancreaticobiliary maljunction without choledochal cysts" How do those PBM patients without choledochal cysts present in clinical practice? A little more information would do better for the general reader. 6. Is there any data regarding the utility of the new magnetic resonance-based method (time-SLIP) to visualize pancreatic juice movement in pancreaticobiliary maljunction? Or has it only been studied in patients without PBM? What are the future implications of this new imaging technique in the management of patients with PBM or pancreaticobiliary reflux? 7. Therapy section needs evidence based information. There are no references. Yours sincerely

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

ESPS manuscript NO: 16694

Title: Pancreaticobiliary reflux as a high-risk factor for biliary malignancy: clinical features and diagnostic advancements.

Reviewer's code: 02860712

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2015-01-28 18:30

Date reviewed: 2015-02-01 23:38

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input checked="" 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"/> 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

The review by Sugita et al is of clinical interest. However, this work should be further improved taking into account the following: A-)The Authors should better describe the clinical background of the biliopancreatic reflux (i.e.symptoms at presentation, rate of cholangitis,) and its relationship with the type of reflux. B-)The results obtained using the technique of the time-spatial labeling inversion pulse should be described in detail. After all, this paragraph is the core of the work. C-) The text is redundant.