

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 46631

Title: Primary malignant melanoma of the biliary tract: case report and review of the literature.

Reviewer's code: 00494239

Reviewer's country: Taiwan

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-03-25 15:37

Reviewer performed review: 2019-03-26 17:07

Review time: 1 Day and 1 Hour

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this case report and review of the literature, some comments are listed 1.The English writing is poor, it should be edited by English native speaker. 2.Regarding the treatment, p1, last line, it is wrong about“ resection of the common hepatic conduct” , it will be

“duct”. Please confirm whether the patient received bil. hepatojejunostomy or other ?
wording” start immunotherapy with nivolumab.” was suggested. Please check” The
patient remains disease-free 36 months after metastatic lung lesion rather than initial
diagnosis (surgery for CHD). 3.P2, conclusion, it is confused when you said “primary
metastatic biliary melanoma”. It should be” primary biliary melanoma, S/P resection
with lung metastasis, treated successfully with immunotherapy” 4.Page 2, in
case presentation, you performed Cholangio-NMR first, then did abdominal CT scan. Is
it useful for diagnosis if you perform CT scan after NMR. Do you perform ERCP before
surgical intervention ? 5.Page 3, is it IV or oral for nivolumab? 6.Page 4, I did not
understand the sentence” This case reveals the excellent response to immunotherapy for
all kinds of patients regardless of the primary origin of the melanoma.” It should be
rewritten. 7. Pag4, Conclusion, it still mild confused when you described “The case of
the patient with metastatic primary biliary melanoma” please verify it.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 46631

Title: Primary malignant melanoma of the biliary tract: case report and review of the literature.

Reviewer's code: 03271124

Reviewer's country: Thailand

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-05-14 05:23

Reviewer performed review: 2019-05-15 07:13

Review time: 1 Day and 1 Hour

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear author, The manuscript entitled "Primary malignant melanoma of the biliary tract: case report and review of the literature" is well written. Comments, 1. The abstract part, in the background section "the patient reported here is the first case of

primary metastatic biliary melanoma treated....after diagnosis". The reader would be confused about the primary or metastatic melanoma of biliary tract. The sentence should be rewrite to "pulmonary metastatic biliary melanoma". 2. What is Cholangio-NMR? This abbreviation should be explained. 3. The figure of CT should be demonstrated in this manuscript. CT findings should be described more details. 4. There are some benign biliary stricture condition that should be preoperatively excluded including IgG4-related sclerosing cholangitis. How about the serum IgG4 level? 5. How about the preoperative cytology and biopsy? ERCP was performed? 6. What is the learning point in this case?

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 46631

Title: Primary malignant melanoma of the biliary tract: case report and review of the literature.

Reviewer's code: 03727100

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-05-13 23:42

Reviewer performed review: 2019-05-16 04:09

Review time: 2 Days and 4 Hours

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you for the report of a rare case. I have some question. 1. In page 1, what did "NMR" mean ? 2. 5 criteria was shown to diagnose primary melanoma in page 3. What items did the case meet? 3. I couldn't find figure 2 and 3. 4. In table 3, what did "CHC"



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

mean ?

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No