

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 78284

**Title:** Diagnosis and treatment of tubal endometriosis in women undergoing laparoscopy: A case series from a single hospital

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 06121310

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-07-06

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-07-07 05:11

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-07-08 07:25

**Review time:** 1 Day and 2 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 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
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



**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>

**Peer-reviewer  
statements**

Peer-Review: [☒] Anonymous [☐] Onymous

Conflicts-of-Interest: [☐] Yes [☒] No

### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Thank you for the opportunity to review interesting manuscript. The authors reviewed 30 patients were diagnosed with pathologically confirmed TEM at Ruijin Hospital from January 2013 to December 2021. It provided a clinical basis for the diagnosis and treatment of TEM. However, here are the contents that need to be revised and improved: 1. Please describe the statistical methods used in this manuscript. 2. A table with the information for multiple patients is suggested. 3. The word "Figsure" is wrong. Please prove that the source of the tissue in the HE-stained figure is the fallopian tube. And the figure 3 should be scaled. 4. Please summarize the significance of this retrospective study in the discussion.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 78284

**Title:** Diagnosis and treatment of tubal endometriosis in women undergoing laparoscopy: A case series from a single hospital

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05374991

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor, Master's Student, Research Assistant

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-07-06

**Reviewer chosen by:** Dong-Mei Wang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-09-01 02:36

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-09-13 22:16

**Review time:** 12 Days and 19 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 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

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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

General Impression: The authors conducted a study to characterize the clinical features and surgical and pathological findings of patients with Fallopian tube endometriosis. This type of endometriosis is often disregarded. Therefore, the aim of the paper is novel. However, the small sample size and the confusing structure of the results are the major disadvantages of this paper. In addition, the authors missed important information in the methods section and the introduction is very brief. I think this manuscript could be worth publishing after having it revised by the authors. Comments: 1) In the background section of the abstract, the core tip and the main text, the definition of tubal endometriosis is imprecise since endometriosis could be present in any layer of the Fallopian tube. Therefore, I suggest writing “within any part of the Fallopian tube”. 2) In the results section of the abstract, please mention the number of patients who had hydrosalpinx. In addition. It would be valuable to know the percentage of patients who conceived naturally and gave birth to healthy babies. 3) In the results section of the abstract, please clarify the meaning of: “some patients had a history of multiple factors”. I prefer deleting this sentence because it was not mentioned in the main text. 4) In the conclusion section of the abstract and the core tip, it is unclear on which basis you concluded that tubal endometriosis is related to the mentioned factors. In addition. Those procedures are common and carried out broadly, unlike tubal endometriosis. which excluded that those could be predisposing factors. 5) The introduction of the main text is very brief, please give a better background about the types of fallopian tube endometriosis and the pathogenesis of endometriosis. Please use this paper as a reference: <https://www.doi.org/10.3390/jcm9061905> 6) In the diagnostic criteria of



**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>

TEM section, please clarify whether you used immunohistochemistry (mainly ER for the glands and CD10 for the stroma) to diagnose endometriosis. In addition, please state whether or not you gave special consideration to potential lesions in the medial portion of the Fallopian tube since tubal endometriosis at this part could be confused with endometrial epithelization of the Fallopian tube. Please read carefully this paper: <https://www.doi.org/10.3390/jcm9061905> 7) In the statistical analysis section, please mention what statistical tests you used to determine the data distribution. 8) In the clinical manifestations section, please mention what were the symptoms (if any) of the two patients who had only tubal endometriosis. 9) In the clinical manifestations section, please explain what is a tubal cystectomy. I am not familiar with this procedure. 10) In the clinical manifestations section, according to the text, the mean age of the patients was calculated based on the data of 29 patients only while you had 30 patients. Please clarify this point. 11) In the laparoscopic surgery section, please explain the meaning of “twisted enlargement”. I am not familiar with this pathology. Are you referring to tubal torsion? 12) I would suggest summarizing the main findings of the results in tables with frequencies and percentages.

## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 78284

**Title:** Diagnosis and treatment of tubal endometriosis in women undergoing laparoscopy: A case series from a single hospital

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 06121310

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-07-06

**Reviewer chosen by:** Han Zhang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-10-11 03:48

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-10-11 07:07

**Review time:** 3 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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
<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Peer-reviewer</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous



**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>

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ☐ ] Yes [ ☒ ] No

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

Please provide the HE-stained figure under low power to prove that the tissue came from the fallopian tube. The current figure can not represent the whole field of it. And please provide the figure of IHC.

## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 78284

**Title:** Diagnosis and treatment of tubal endometriosis in women undergoing laparoscopy: A case series from a single hospital

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05374991

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor, Master's Student, Research Assistant

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-07-06

**Reviewer chosen by:** Han Zhang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-10-11 15:25

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-10-12 00:14

**Review time:** 8 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Peer-reviewer</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous





**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

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Authors, Thank you for taking the time to revise your manuscript and addressing my comments. I confirm that most of my questions were appropriately answered. However, three comments were not corrected in the same text but sufficiently addressed in the answer to reviewers files. Please ensure to correct the following in the main text: Comments: 1) Regarding the conclusions section of the abstract, it still states the following "The related factors of TEM may include tubal sterilization, IUD insertion, and other uterine cavity operation". These are edited in the main text but not in the abstract. Please revise this part carefully and delete irrelevant content. 2) Please include the answer to (comment 6) in the diagnostic criteria of the TEM section of the main text. 3) Please include the figure used to answer (comment 11) of the previous round along with its explanation in the main manuscript.