PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 42752

Title: Long-term survival of a patient with a large adrenal primitive neuroectodermal tumor: A case report and review of literature

Reviewer's code: 00503228

Reviewer's country: Iran

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2018-10-13

Date reviewed: 2018-10-13

Review time: 10 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	[ ] Accept (High priority)	Peer-Review:
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] Accept (General priority)	[Y] Anonymous
[Y] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Minor revision	[ ] Onymous
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejection	[Y] Major revision	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
[ ] Grade E: Do not publish		[ ] Rejection	[ ] Advanced
			[Y] General
			[ ] No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			[ ] Yes
			[Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Good paper; but you should have concentrated on the main differences existing in your case versus others. The most prominent factor is the relatively excellent outcome despite the big size in your patient versus the literature. So I recommend you to change the title

to: "Long-term survival of a patient with a large adrenal primitive neuroectodermal tumor: a case report and literature review" Or something (e.g. favorable outcome of treatment...,); in the second place, you should give your patient's in as much detailed data as possible. For example you declared "The tumor markers and adrenal endocrinological examinations showed normal except for the elevated serum β2-microglobulin." This is too much concise. You should give all detailed data of your measurements not only the hormones and adrenal markers, but also the electrolytes, urine exams, the physical examinations, blood pressures and so. Try to find something specific in your case that could explain your patient's excellent outcome, and compare them to the literature data. If you are successful to find something that meaningfully can explain this, then your case report may receive large audience and citations. In the discussion section also try to go through this approach, and instead of general comments about the adrenal PNETs, you try to be specific on the details of your case.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

[ ] The same title

[ ] Duplicate publication

[ ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

BPG Search:

[ ] The same title

[ ] Duplicate publication

[ ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 42752

Title: Long-term survival of a patient with a large adrenal primitive neuroectodermal tumor: A case report and review of literature

Reviewer's code: 03475636

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2018-10-13

Date reviewed: 2018-10-13

Review time: 13 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	[ ] Accept (High priority)	Peer-Review:
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] Accept (General priority)	[Y] Anonymous
[Y] Grade C: Good	[Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Minor revision	[ ] Onymous
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejection	[Y] Major revision	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
[ ] Grade E: Do not publish		[ ] Rejection	[ ] Advanced
			[Y] General
			[ ] No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			[ ] Yes
			[Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I have no conflicts of interest. there are several misused and misspelled words, the manuscript would benefit from additional copy edits.   To mention as a few below: RE: "oth cPNETs and pPNETs are aggressive tumors, but they differ in their cell of origin." I

believe you mean "Both", not "oth". RE: "Adrenal PNET is very rare, and here are no well-established guidelines or treatment strategies for PNET. [10]". You mean "there" or "here"? RE: "However, radical resection can not be guaranteed". "can not" should be "cannot" RE "(n=15 in Asian vs 1 in USA)" "USA" should "the United States" RE "an unique translocation" should be "a unique translocation" RE "FNA also increases the risk for tumor spread" "for" should be "of"

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

BPG Search:

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No