

Reviewer #1

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: This manuscript is a nice, updated summary on calcifying fibrous tumor (CFT) in the gastrointestinal (GI) tract. This update is a useful summary, as CFT has been increasingly recognized in the GI tract in recent years, whereas older literature has primarily focused on it as a soft tissue tumor. I have a few significant suggestions for revision, and a few very minor suggestions. Suggestion #1 The authors have a section discussing the possible pathogenesis of CFT, discussing the hypotheses that CFT may be related to either IgG4-related disease (IRD) or inflammatory myofibroblastic tumor (IMT). However, prior literature has suggested other relationships, as well. Several reports of CFT co-existing with hyaline vascular type Castleman disease exist (for example, PMID 31160859, 10605414) and with sclerosing angiomatoid nodular transformation of the spleen (SANT) (PMID 20021608, 17389168). CFT has also been proposed to be a reactive proliferation after trauma (PMID 31160859, 9413045). Additional discussion of the relationships to hyaline vascular type Castleman disease, SANT, and trauma, as well as the possibility that CFT may simply represent an end-stage process without regard to a specific etiology, should be included. Suggestion #2 The authors include a broad list of differential diagnostic considerations. However, the authors do not mention reactive nodular fibrous pseudotumor (RNFP) (PMID 12657940), which is morphologically perhaps the most similar lesion to CFT, being a paucicellular mass lesion with abundant collagen and sparse lymphoid infiltrate. A brief paragraph addressing the similarities and differences between CFT and RNFP should be included. Very minor suggestions On page 6, paragraph 2, "positive" should be "positively". On page 6, paragraph 3, "positive" should be "positively". On page 6, paragraph 3, "IgG4-related lesions" should be "IgG4-

related disease" On page 8, paragraph 1, "from molecular level" should be "at the molecular level"

Answer to reviewer #1: Great comments. We have updated based on reviewer's comments.

Editorial Office's comments

Science Editor: 1 Scientific quality: This is a minireview of the calcifying fibrous tumors. The topic is within the scope of the WJG. (1) Classification: Grade B; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: This manuscript is a nice, updated summary on calcifying fibrous tumor in the gastrointestinal tract. This update is a useful summary, as CFT has been increasingly recognized in the GI tract in recent years, whereas older literature has primarily focused on it as a soft tissue tumor. However, there are some issues should be addressed. Additional discussion of the relationships to hyaline vascular type Castleman disease, SANT, and trauma, as well as the possibility that CFT may simply represent an end-stage process without regard to a specific etiology, should be included. A brief paragraph addressing the similarities and differences between CFT and RNFP should be included. The questions raised by the reviewers should be answered; and (3) Format: There are 2 figures. A total of 40 references are cited, including 9 references published in the last 3 years. There are no self-citations. 2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade A. 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 invited manuscript. The study is without financial support. The topic has not previously been published in the WJG. The corresponding author has published 2 articles in the BPG. 5 Issues raised: 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. 6 Re-Review: Not required. 7 Recommendation: Conditionally accepted.

Answer to Science Editor: Thank you. The original pictures submitted for review were in a PDF format. Based on the requirement, now 2 separate figures (Figure 1 with 2 panels and Figure 2 with 4 panels) are in PowerPoint file.