

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**Manuscript NO:** 66416

**Title:** Hepatic perivascular epithelioid cell tumor: Clinicopathological analysis of 26 cases with emphasis on disease management and prognosis

**Reviewer's code:** 05846802

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Japan

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-03-29

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-03-30 07:02

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-04-01 09:27

**Review time:** 2 Days and 2 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

In this article, the authors evaluated 26 patients with hepatic perivascular epithelioid cell tumor (PEComa). This article is the largest study in patients with hepatic PEComa who underwent liver resection. As the authors state, preoperative diagnosis is difficult and PEComa has a malignant potential, therefore, liver resection is the optimal treatment. This theme is very interesting and worth to be reported. Here below my concern.

Questions and comments to authors: Major 1. What is the surgical method of “hepatic lobe enlargement resection”? Does it mean that the operator has a large surgical margin? In this article, surgical methods were classified by two surgical procedures, simple resection and enlargement resection groups. However, it is concerned that these comparison are not correct, because enlargement liver resection might be simply needed in those each cases. Simple resection was needed the patients with small size tumor. Therefore, I think that Table 4 is not needed. 2. In adjuvant chemotherapy, who received the mTOR inhibitor sirolimus? What were the pathological findings of tumor in patients with mTOR therapy? Please tell us the criteria of using mTOR in your institute. 3. As the authors state, hepatic PEComa is difficult to distinguish from malignant disease and to diagnose preoperatively. According to the article and previously reported, malignant potential seemed to be very low only in hepatic PEComa compared to the other primary tumor. This is a concern because if diagnose is obtained by biopsy, surgical intervention may not be needed. If patients who have diagnosis by biopsy with hepatic PEComa do not have any symptoms, do you do the surgical resection? Minor Please describe the approval number of the ethics committees of hospital partaking in this study.

## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**Manuscript NO:** 66416

**Title:** Hepatic perivascular epithelioid cell tumor: clinicopathological analysis of 26 cases with emphasis on disease management and prognosis

**Reviewer's code:** 05846802

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Japan

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-03-29

**Reviewer chosen by:** Yun-Xiaojuan Wu

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-06-15 08:40

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-06-16 00:34

**Review time:** 15 Hours

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

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Comments to Author Thank you for your response to my comments on the peer review. This article is very interesting as having commented by the last review, "This theme is very interesting and worth to be reported". I confirmed a corrected article. The article was corrected adequately.