

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 51980

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

Reviewer's code: 05079464

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: DDS, PhD

Professional title: Doctor, Professor, Research Scientist, Teacher

Reviewer's country: Mexico

Author's country: China

Reviewer chosen by: Jie Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-11-25 17:34

Reviewer performed review: 2019-12-06 17:50

Review time: 11 Days

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" 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



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

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

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. 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. 3 Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? R= Yes, they do. 4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? R= Yes, it does. 5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? R= Yes, it does. 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 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. 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 9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? R= N/A 10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? R= Yes, it does. 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. 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

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. 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. 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 specific what kind of investigations will be associated to this case. 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)? 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...” 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?



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

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

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.

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: 51980

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

Reviewer's code: 02728466

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's country: Greece

Author's country: China

Reviewer chosen by: Jie Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-12-08 07:26

Reviewer performed review: 2019-12-09 17:54

Review time: 1 Day and 10 Hours

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 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 type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

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

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

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

BPG Search:

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