



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

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

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 90212

Title: Clinical analysis of 12 cases of ovarian neuroendocrine carcinoma

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03354704

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Canada

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-11-27

Reviewer chosen by: Yu-Lu Chen

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-12-11 17:29

Reviewer performed review: 2023-12-18 06:04

Review time: 6 Days and 12 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 Grade E: Do not publish |
| Novelty of this manuscript | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty |
| Creativity or innovation of this manuscript | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation |

| | |
|---|--|
| Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance |
| 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

Summary This was a retrospective review of 12 patients with neuroendocrine carcinomas (NECs) of the ovary, analyzing clinicopathologic features, treatment modalities and outcomes. The aim of the study was to enhance our understanding of ovarian NECs. The authors conclude that these tumors are rare, commonly involve young women and behave aggressively. Surgery is the mainstay of treatment with some benefit from adjuvant chemotherapy. **Comments** Of the 12 cases of NECs, 9 were small cell carcinoma and 3 large cell NEC. A major problem with the paper relates to terminology, classification and definition of these ovarian tumors. i) The small cell carcinoma, is this the hypercalcemic type? ii) SMARCA4 studies are very important in the classification. I don't see this mentioned in the manuscript. iii) The 3 large cell NECs: were they pure large cell, or small cell carcinoma with a large cell component? iv) CD56 aside, the immunohistochemical characterization (Cg- A 5/10, Syn 9/11) may not be sufficiently robust. v) The majority of small cell carcinomas arise in the lungs. In some cases, their initial manifestation may be as ovarian metastasis. A combination of imaging and immunohistochemistry may help to clarify this. **Conclusion** In my opinion, the

above-described 12 cases should be much better characterized using clinical, morphologic and molecular parameters in order to have better understanding of their neuroendocrine nature. Thank you.

RE-PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 90212

Title: Clinical analysis of 12 cases of ovarian neuroendocrine carcinoma

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03354704

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Canada

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-11-27

Reviewer chosen by: Yu-Lu Chen

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-12-11 17:29

Reviewer performed review: 2023-12-18 06:04

Review time: 6 Days and 12 Hours

| | |
|---|---|
| Scientific quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input 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 |
| Novelty of this manuscript | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty |
| Creativity or innovation of this manuscript | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation |



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

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

| | |
|---|--|
| Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance |
| Language quality | <input 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 type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection |
| Re-review | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Peer-reviewer statements | Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous |
| | Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS