

December 31, 2019

Dear Editor,

Please find enclosed the edited manuscript in Word format (file name : 51980-review.doc) .

Title: Peutz-Jeghers syndrome with mesenteric fibromatosis : A case report and review of literature

Author: Huai-Jie Cai, Han Wang, Nan Cao, Wei Wang, Xi-Xi Sun, Bin Huang

Name of Journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

ESPS Manuscript NO : 51980

The manuscript has been improved according to the suggestions of reviews:

1. Format has been updated.
2. Revision has been made according to the suggestions of the reviewers

Reviewer #1:

Comment 1: This is a well written paper. However, there are some suggestions for improvement. 1.The sentence “ For PJS combined with MF, R0 resection to the greatest extent as possible is the best treatment.” should be supported by relevant references.

Revision 1: We thank the reviewer for this comment. Relevant references have been supported.

Comment 2: You could explain in more details about incision class 3.

Revision 2: We thank the reviewer for this comment. The incision class 3 has been explained.

Comment 3: The paragraph “ Endoscopic polypectomy is currently the main treatment, but in the following cases, surgery is necessary:.....” should be supported by the appropriate references.

Revision 3: We thank the reviewer for this comment. The appropriate references have been supported.

Comment 4: The sentence “Because magnetic resonance imaging has strong soft tissue resolution, it is necessary when liposarcoma is suspected. “ should be supported by relevant references and also it should be discussed in relation to this case.

Revision 4: We thank the reviewer for this comment. Relevant references have been supported and the relevant content has been discussed.

Comment 5: The sentence “ At this time, fluorine18-fluorodeoxyglucose (18F-FDG) PET/computed tomography can be used to comprehensively evaluate the number and nature of masses, and aid in distinguishing PJS. “ should be discussed in relation to the presented case and supported by relevant references. Please discuss in more detail about the recommended treatment according to the literature.

Revision 5: We thank the reviewer for this comment. Relevant content and references have been revised. The recommended treatment have been revised.

Reviewer #2:

Comment 1: 1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? R= No, it does not. The authors need to explain the objective of the study. I suggested this in the introduction comments.

Revision 1: We thank the reviewer for this comment.

Comment 2: Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? R= Yes, it does, but there are some mistakes that must need to be reviewed.

Revision 2: We thank the reviewer for this comment. The objective of the study has been explained in the introduction.

Comment 3: Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? R= Yes, they do.

Revision 3: We thank the reviewer for this comment.

Comment 4: Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? R= Yes, it does.

Revision 4: We thank the reviewer for this comment.

Comment 5: Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? R= Yes, it does.

Revision 5: We thank the reviewer for this comment.

Comment 6: Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study? What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field? R= N/A.

Revision 6: We thank the reviewer for this comment.

Comment 7: Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically? Are the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner? Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper's scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently? R= Yes, it does.

Revision 7: We thank the reviewer for this comment.

Comment 8: Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents? Do figures require labeling with arrows, asterisks etc., better legends? R= Yes, they are. However, I have some observation that need be review.

Revision 8: We thank the reviewer for this comment.

Comment 9: Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? R= N/A.

Revision 9: We thank the reviewer for this comment.

Comment 10: Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? R= Yes, it does.

Revision 10: We thank the reviewer for this comment.

Comment 11: References. Does the manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections? Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references? R= Yes, it does.

Revision 11: We thank the reviewer for this comment.

Comment 12: Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate? R= Yes, it is.

Revision 12: We thank the reviewer for this comment.

Comment 13: Research methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to manuscript type and the appropriate categories, as follows: (1) CARE Checklist (2013) - Case report; (2) CONSORT 2010 Statement - Clinical Trials study, Prospective study, Randomized Controlled trial, Randomized Clinical trial; (3) PRISMA 2009 Checklist - Evidence-Based Medicine, Systematic review, Meta-Analysis; (4) STROBE Statement - Case Control study, Observational study, Retrospective Cohort study; and (5) The ARRIVE Guidelines - Basic study. Did the author prepare the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting? R= Yes, the author did.

Revision 13: We thank the reviewer for this comment.

Comment 14: Ethics statements. For all manuscripts involving human studies and/or animal experiments, author(s) must submit the related formal ethics documents that were reviewed and approved by their local ethical review committee. Did the manuscript meet the requirements of ethics? R= Yes, it did.

Revision 14: We thank the reviewer for this comment.

Comment 15: ABSTRACT COMMENTS: The abstract was adequately made; however, I have an observation about it. The authors indicate that the manuscript is important for future research, but they do not specify what kind of investigations will be associated to this case.

Revision 15: We thank the reviewer for this comment. The abstract has been revised.

Comment 16: CORE TIP: It is similar to the abstract. Moreover, what type of future references will be provided regarding the type of research (number of cases, epidemiologic studies, basic studies, proteins related to fibromatosis and PJ)?

Revision 16: We thank the reviewer for this comment. The core tip has been revised.

Comment 17: INTRODUCTION The introduction is adequate and well explained, however I suggest that the paragraph in which the case report is described be eliminated and then substitute it by the objective of the study, for example “we reported a case...”

Revision 17: We thank the reviewer for this comment. The introduction has been revised.

Comment 18: CASE REPORT The case report was well described, and it provided an important information about the MF and PJS. I consider that this section is interesting, however, I have some questions related about the immunoexpression. In the case report, immunohistochemistry studies that the authors made used several antibodies including Ki-67. The question is, why did not the authors show the microphotographs of the immunohistochemistry? and the second question is, why did not the authors, report the label index of Ki-67?

Revision 18: We thank the reviewer for this comment. The case report has been revised. The microphotographs of the immunohistochemistry have been added.

Comment 19: DISCUSSION The discussion is updated, well described, and the authors give important information about mechanisms of cell proliferation and polyps. Overall the manuscript is well made, updated, and the discussion gives information that will be used in future researches related to JPS. The description is well made, and the discussion is updated, however the study has some deficiencies that must be reviewed

Revision 19: We thank the reviewer for this comment. Some deficiencies have been revised.

Thank you again for publishing our manuscript in World Journal of Clinical Cases.

Sincerely yours,

Bin Huang,

Zhejiang Hospital, 1229 Gudun road, Hangzhou 310013, Zhejiang Province, China. hb2k@163.com

Telephone: +86-571-88091118

Fax: +86-0571-88098123