

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 66162

Title: Surgical treatment of liver metastasis with uveal melanoma: A case report

Reviewer's code: 05121545

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, MSc

Professional title: Doctor, Professor, Reader (Associate Professor)

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Brazil

Author's Country/Territory: South Korea

Manuscript submission date: 2021-05-19

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-05-28 18:11

Reviewer performed review: 2021-05-31 02:25

Review time: 2 Days and 8 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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

-In the abstract, the author do not address de additions to the medical literature provided by this report. -In the conclusion of the abstract, the authors should include the main "take-away" lesson. -The order of events and treatments are confusing. The inclusion of a timeline including the landmarks of this case and organizing the treatments (surgeries, chemotherapies, radiotherapy) would clarify the understanding. -In the section Interventions, the authors should give more details about the surgical techniques and also about the chemotherapy protocols/regimens (dosing, schedule of administration, interval between, and the number of cycles). -About the loss of follow-up, the authors should inform if the medical records or the civil registers in their country give any information about possible outcomes of the patient. There was an effort to contact the patient or family looking for information?

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 66162

Title: Surgical treatment of liver metastasis with uveal melanoma: A case report

Reviewer's code: 03261985

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Chief Doctor, Director, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: South Korea

Manuscript submission date: 2021-05-19

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-05-27 00:58

Reviewer performed review: 2021-06-05 03:13

Review time: 9 Days and 2 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input 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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

It is well written case report. Usually, prognosis of metastatic melanoma is quite poor. There are some points the author should improve before acceptance Major points 1. I agree the indication of hepatectomy in this patients, however, rationale of the surgical indication is not fully discussed in discussion section. The author describe prognostic factors of the metastatic melanoma. So, they should discuss how they indicate hepatectomy. 2. Last sentence of the CONCLUSION is not supported by the main text. Instead of this sentence, I recommend to use following kind of sentence "Discussion and selection of optimal treatment plan and timing are required in patients with uveal melanoma liver metastasis", et al. 3. The authors describe disease free of the patients after hepatectomy. Imaging devices and timing that confirm disease free should be described in the main text Minor points 1. In page 5, line 11, the author describe left neck dissection. Is it "left neck lymph node dissection"?