

## ESPS Peer-review Report

**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Gastrointestinal Pathophysiology

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 6499

**Title:** The Pathophysiology of Autoimmune Pancreatitis

**Reviewer code:** 00058327

**Science editor:** Ma, Ya-Juan

**Date sent for review:** 2013-10-22 18:11

**Date reviewed:** 2013-10-25 19:19

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existed	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Major comments Conclusions; the authors must make comments on future possibilities of research and diagnostic tools in this or these diseases .Are they different diseases or different presentation of the same one. Minor comments In Animal models.. The same model used model..

## ESPS Peer-review Report

**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Gastrointestinal Pathophysiology

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 6499

**Title:** The Pathophysiology of Autoimmune Pancreatitis

**Reviewer code:** 00947129

**Science editor:** Ma, Ya-Juan

**Date sent for review:** 2013-10-22 18:11

**Date reviewed:** 2013-10-27 23:20

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existed	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Pezzili and Pagano wrote a brief review on the pathophysiology of autoimmune pancreatitis focusing on humoral and cellular responses. The humoral part is fairly concise and decent. However, the cellular immune activation part is too short and lashed together. Much more is known on the latter topic. E.g. no detailed analysis of cellular response in type 1 and type 2 AIP is provided. I have some major concerns regarding the figures. Generally, they are of poor quality. Please show scale bars, rather than indicating the original magnification (isn't the magnification 200 instead of 20 for fig. 1?). On page 3, line 2 from the bottom, Figure 1 is not actually showing various types of immune cells (at least you can't tell from the histological picture that they are of different types). It would also be nice to indicate alterations such as infiltrates and fibrosis by signs (arrows, stars) on the figure. Additionally, it would be great if you could demonstrate alterations at higher magnification. Does figure 2 show a pancreatic section? Is CD20 positivity always so focal in AIP? Also, I do not quite understand why there is a separate section on "Animal models for studying the pathophysiology of AIP" just before the conclusions. This is out of place and could be incorporated in the previous sections. The conclusions should state the take-home message, so I find it inappropriate that the authors review their own findings in this place (last sentence). Some minor points: Near the middle of page 2: "B cells with the CD20 antibody" does not make sense. Near the middle of page 2: regarding instead of egarding. Page 3, line 6 from the bottom. regarding instead of egarding. Throughout the paper: *in vivo* and *in vitro* should be written in italics. Page 7, line 6 from the bottom: The same model used model??? Page 7, line 5 from the bottom: It is also possible "to" induce... In ref. 9, is the publication year 2011 (as indicated after the article title) or 2012?