



**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

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 34959

Title: Prognostic factors of response to endoscopic treatment in painful chronic pancreatitis

Reviewer's code: 00068567

Reviewer's country: Thailand

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2017-07-01

Date reviewed: 2017-07-13

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

1 The abstracts should be rewritten as the context of the abstract did not show main results of the study as it was described in the context 2. In table 2 and table 3, it should be presented at odds ratio rather than 2 by 2 column. 3. In table 5, although the authors did not have information of pain score before and after treatment but it should be clarified that when authors call successful pain reduction. Moreover it is unfair to conclude clinical result at the end after study without showing information that how long the patient had been followed up before the clinical results were concluded. In fact definition of success should be clearly clarified such as successful pain reduction with or without stent in place, what the definition of no recurrent is? etc. Authors stated that median follow up time was 15 months. 4. In table 6 the super script might be wrong please clarify. Please clarify in the description of the table what is the procedural definition. 5. In table 6, 7, it should be presented as odds ratio instead of two by two



**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

table



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 34959

Title: Prognostic factors of response to endoscopic treatment in painful chronic pancreatitis

Reviewer's code: 03645515

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2017-07-01

Date reviewed: 2017-07-15

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"/> 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 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 type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a retrospective study discussing the efficacy of endoscopic therapy in chronic pancreatitis. Overall the study is well written. Results are clear and to the point. Major concern: The tone of the study is over enthusiastic. The notion that almost 100% of patients had some improvement with endoscopic therapy is not consistent with published data. Authors did not do any objective assessment of pain control. This has to be stated clearly in the discussion as a major limitation. Minor concerns abstract says: "Pain disappeared completely in 52 patients (49.52%) and improved in 53 patients (50.48%)(P < 0.001) during follow-up." This is in contradiction with the discussion where it mentioned only 80% response rate for pain.



**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

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 34959

Title: Prognostic factors of response to endoscopic treatment in painful chronic pancreatitis

Reviewer's code: 03475360

Reviewer's country: Poland

Science editor: Ya-Juan Ma

Date sent for review: 2017-07-01

Date reviewed: 2017-07-23

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"/> 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 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

Literature includes really a lot of similar studies concerning the efficacy of endotherapy in reduction of pain in patients with chronic pancreatitis. Despite this I hold the view that the paper sent for a review is designed well enough, is conducted on a large group of patients and describes the new approach to the position of endotherapy in treatment of patients suffering from chronic pancreatitis. I find this paper worth to be published, but only after fixing: - there is a great discrepancy between the data from the abstract and the main text of manuscript - the discussion should include wider description how the paper contributes to the current literature in order to prove that the paper is not derivative - the conclusion should be stated more clearly - the tables in the paper are not compatible with the main text of the manuscript.