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

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology
ESPS manuscript NO: 22187
Title: Management of pancreatic fluid collections: A comprehensive review of the literature
Reviewer's code: 00001832
Reviewer's country: Germany
Science editor: Jing Yu
Date sent for review: 2015-08-20 08:24
Date reviewed: 2015-10-06 01:30

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[Y] Grade B: Very good	[Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] The same title	[ ] High priority for publication
[ ] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Duplicate publication	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	[ ] Plagiarism	[Y] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	[ ] Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript by Amy Tyberg and co-workers reviews the management of pancreatic fluid collections. This is an up-to-date, comprehensive and well written review of an interesting topic. Some minor comments: Cysotgastrostomy is not the only surgical means of drainage; depending on the location cystojejunostomy is a surgical alternative that should be mentioned. The authors state that "ERCP with PD exploration should be concurrently performed to evaluate for evidence of PD disruption in all patients with PFCs." I do not believe that this is really necessary in all patients; more like in all patients with suspicion of PD disruption. What about MRCP in this setting? Any word regarding long term therapy of PD disruption? Stenting, or surgical measures? AP is not the only cause of pancreatic fluid collection. The authors could include a short paragraph about other causes (e.g. post-resection or -transplantation, or traumatic).

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

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology
ESPS manuscript NO: 22187
Title: Management of pancreatic fluid collections: A comprehensive review of the literature
Reviewer's code: 02544259
Reviewer's country: Japan
Science editor: Jing Yu
Date sent for review: 2015-08-20 08:24
Date reviewed: 2015-10-13 12:56

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[Y] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] The same title	[ ] High priority for publication
[ ] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Duplicate publication	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	[ ] Plagiarism	[Y] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	[ ] Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This manuscript is very good. Please, add my manuscript at surgical drainage section; Intragastric stapled pancreatic pseudocystgastrostomy under endoscopic guidance. Iso Y, Kubota K. Surg Laparosc Endosc Percutan Tech. 2013 Jun;23(3):330-3.

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

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology
ESPS manuscript NO: 22187
Title: Management of pancreatic fluid collections: A comprehensive review of the literature
Reviewer's code: 01804189
Reviewer's country: India
Science editor: Jing Yu
Date sent for review: 2015-08-20 08:24
Date reviewed: 2015-10-13 19:12

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[Y] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[Y] Accept
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] The same title	[ ] High priority for publication
[ ] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Duplicate publication	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	[ ] Plagiarism	[ ] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	[ ] Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

First of all authors deserve congratulation for writing a comprehensive review with extensive search of literature. I would like the authors to explain: 1. Do all patients of WOPN require DEN 2. Is there any data on the percentage of solid material inside WOPN which will decide whether DEN is required or simple dilatation of track, placement of stents and nasocystic irrigation will be sufficient. 3. Do we require removal of each and every piece of of necrotic material from WOPN for complete clinical success. Can not we follow an approach of vigorous irrigation of cystic cavity for 2-3 days followed by one or two session of DEN to remove majority of necrotic material rather than four or five sessions of dilatation and entery into cyst and DEN which leads to more complications.

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

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology
ESPS manuscript NO: 22187
Title: Management of pancreatic fluid collections: A comprehensive review of the literature
Reviewer's code: 00918007
Reviewer's country: Italy
Science editor: Jing Yu
Date sent for review: 2015-08-20 08:24
Date reviewed: 2015-10-14 03:42

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] The same title	[ ] High priority for publication
[Y] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Duplicate publication	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	[ ] Plagiarism	[Y] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	[ ] Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The Authors give a complete and useful review of the avaiable methods for the treatment of pancreatic fluid collections. Minor revisions are required: Pag 10: "Indications for drainage": references should be added when the Authors stated that recently mini-invasive approach has become the standard approach Furthermore, the Authors should better clarify waht "symptomatic" means. Does it mean fever, pain, or what else?? Is there any size limit to decide to drain? Take home messages should be used at the end of single paragraph or at the end of the manuscript but NOT in both cases. Please choose one of the two.