

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

→I submitted the manuscript to English proofreading again.

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: Page 4 and page 10, the "Conclusion". I suggest the authors to include the unique clinical features of this case to distinguish this case from others.

→I improved the "Conclusion" part.

(1) Science editor: 1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes a case report of oral granuloma in a pediatric patient with chronic graft-versus-host disease. The topic is within the scope of the WJCC. (1) Classification: Grade B; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: The authors found that it is necessary to follow up with patients who develop GVHD with oral granulomatous lesions to detect any malignancies as early as possible; and (3) Format: There is 1 table and 5 figures. A total of 9 references are cited, including 0 reference published in the last 3 years. There are no self-citations. 2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade B. A language editing certificate issued by Enago was provided. 3 Academic norms and rules: The authors provided the signed Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure Form and Copyright License Agreement, No academic misconduct was found in the CrossCheck detection and Bing search. 4 Supplementary comments: This is an unsolicited manuscript. The topic has not previously been published in the WJCC. The corresponding author has not published articles in the BPG. 5 Issues raised: (1) I found the authors did not provide the original figures. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor; and (2) I found the authors did not add the PMID and DOI in the reference list. Please provide the PubMed numbers and DOI citation numbers to the reference list and list all authors of the references. Please revise throughout.

→I provided the original figures, which could be reprocessed by the editor, and added the PMID and DOI in the reference list.

6 Re-Review: Required. 7 Recommendation: Conditionally accepted.

(2) Editorial office director: I have checked the comments written by the science editor. The authors need to fill out the CARE Checklist–2016 with page numbers.

→I filled out the CARE Checklist–2016 with page numbers.

(3) Company editor-in-chief: I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, the full text of the manuscript, the relevant ethics documents, and the English Language Certificate, all of which

have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Clinical Cases, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors.