



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 52868

Title: Clinicopathologic characteristics of prostatic stromal sarcoma with rhabdoid features: A case report

Reviewer's code: 00722963

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's country: Serbia

Author's country: China

Reviewer chosen by: Artificial Intelligence Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-12-12 07:04

Reviewer performed review: 2019-12-13 20:02

Review time: 1 Day and 12 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



**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

Title: it does reflect the main subject of the manuscript properly Abstract: in few words it present the main focus and facts of the manuscript. Key words: adequate Background: the authors gave proper data on the frequency of this rare type of tumor., which is one of the important significances of this paper. The literature used, and the data given in the background are well chosen. Methods: Since this paper is not based on the experiment, only dethodology of diagnosing the tumor can be commented. Radiological findings and images are of high quality. Regarding pathology methods, hematoxylin and eosin staining is routine so no detailed explanation is needed. Regarding the immunohistochemistry, it is usual and required to state the type of the antibody, manufacturer and the dillution if the antibody applied is not of "ready to use" type. So that must be added in "Pathology and immunohistochemistry examinations" subtitle. In the same section, there is this part of the sentence: "per 10 high power field (HPF unit)"... It is OK to introduce HPF abbreviation, but the word "unit" is not suppose to be there. I think that this is a mistake during the translation, if a translator is not well into pathology terms. Results: Researchers gave detailed insight into the morphology and immunohistochemical properties of the tumor, which is highly valuable to other pathologists who encounter this entity or if this entity is a part od differential diagnosis. It has significant contributions to the the correct diagnosis of tumor. Discussion: In the Discussion, authors interpret the findings adequately and appropriately. They compared their findings with the ones of others, summarazing the features of the tumor. They gave reasonable explanations why their findings differ from others. Authors gave logical and possible explanations of the nature of the tumor, accuretely referring to some signaling mechanisms which might be enroled, giving the right perspective to the sscientific and practical significance of this case. Illustrations and tables: Figures and tables are sufficient, of good quality. Histological images are very nice, and I have only few suggestions regarding the legends. First, after the numkber of the figure there should

be full-stop (Figure 1.) and it is missing in all figure legends. Unless this is specific instruction of the Journal.... Second, it is not usual to say "original magnification x 40". Just write "magnification x40" or only "x40". No need for spacing between x and 40. Also, abbreviation H&E is written without the spacing between (H&E, not H & E). "

Figure 2. C: Areas of poor differentiation of embryonoid rhabdomyoblasts, having eccentric nuclei and unremarkable cross-striations" Too small

magnification to discuss whether there are or not cross striations. "Figure

2.D: The tumor cells showing the characteristic of nuclear division (up to 20 mitoses per 10 high power field). On this image there are not 20 mitoses so a

reader less involved in pathology might be confused... So this data in the brackets should be included in textual results, not within image legend. "Figure 3

Angiomatoid type cells were present in the tumor of our case of prostatic stromal sarcoma with rhabdoid features. Immunostaining of the tumor cells for vimentin was diffuse and strong. Hematoxylin and eosin stain, original magnification × 20."

Figure 3. If the second sentence say that it is staining for vimentin, than the third sentence is incorrect, because this is not hematoxilin and eosin stain!!! It should be like this: Figure 3. Angiomatoid type cells present in the prostatic stromal sarcoma with rhabdoid features. Immunostaining for vimentin was diffuse and strong (x20).

"Figure 5. B: The Ki-67 labeling index is 67%" The value of Ki-67 is stated in the text, it should not be repeated in figure legend. It should be (B: The Ki-67 staining")

Biostatistics: There is no reason for statistics in this paper. Units. The manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units. References: The literature is not completelz of recent zears, but I find it OK since the tumor is realy rare. Aldough some references should be more recent. There is one citation from 2016 and one from 2014 and all other are older. There are no self-citations, incorrections Quality of manuscript

organization and presentation: The manuscript is well, concisely and coherently



**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

organized and presented. The style, language and grammar are accurate and appropriate. Research methods and reporting. Appropriate Ethics statements: This document is in chinese, so I can not say anything on this topic.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

BPG Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No