

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 57213

Title: Laparoscopic resection of primary retroperitoneal schwannoma: a case report

Reviewer's code: 04721358

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: Brazil

Manuscript submission date: 2020-05-28

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-05-29 05:45

Reviewer performed review: 2020-06-03 08:45

Review time: 5 Days and 3 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Authors report a rare case of benign retroperitoneal schwannoma successfully treated with laparoscopic resection. the paper is interesting, but I have some concerns about it.

1- This patient underwent orthopedic operation just before incidentally tumor's detection: did the patient perform CT or MRI for evaluation of orthopedic pathology before surgery? 2- Authors performed tumor's resection with lymphadenectomy. Which is the rationale for lymphadenectomy for this type of tumor (benign non epithelial tumor)? Which lymph node stations were removed? Pathologic examination of removed nodes is lacking. 3- What means "tactical" cholecystectomy? 4- the number and position of trocars should be reported together with the duration of operation.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 57213

Title: Laparoscopic resection of primary retroperitoneal schwannoma: a case report

Reviewer's code: 03807130

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: Brazil

Manuscript submission date: 2020-05-28

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-06-06 14:45

Reviewer performed review: 2020-06-07 14:26

Review time: 23 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors presented the clinical management and implication of retroperitoneal schwannoma and it is valuable cases. However, since this paper is not well up to the standard of WJCC, this paper should not be acceptable for the publication in this form.

Major points (1) Please add the Table of similar cases described in the literature. (2) Please separate the section of Discussion to understand easily. Minor points (3) The authors should describe the reason why they performed lymphadenectomy. (4) The authors should describe the necessity of oncological follow-up after the resection of retroperitoneal schwannoma because the anatomopathological report showed non-malignant schwannoma. (5) Please add the references to the sentence “it accounts for only 0.5% to 5% of all cases of it.” (Introduction, page 3), “This tumor type accounts for approximately 0.5% to 12% of retroperitoneal tumors. (Discussion, page 6)” (6) Authors should clarify the word “sagittal section, coronal ? (Figure 1)” (7) Authors should consider the association between epidural collection (bloody?) and schwannoma.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 57213

Title: Laparoscopic resection of primary retroperitoneal schwannoma: a case report

Reviewer's code: 04721358

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: Brazil

Manuscript submission date: 2020-05-28

Reviewer chosen by: Ya-Juan Ma

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-07-27 15:25

Reviewer performed review: 2020-07-30 12:46

Review time: 2 Days and 21 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript has been improved