



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 81259

**Title:** Recurrent intramuscular lipoma at extensor pollicis brevis: A case report and literature review

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05589261

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Research Scientist

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** United States

**Author's Country/Territory:** South Korea

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-11-01

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-11-20 18:37

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-11-28 20:30

**Review time:** 8 Days and 1 Hour

<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 Grade E: Do not publish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>Novelty of this manuscript</b>	<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
<b>Creativity or innovation of this manuscript</b>	<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:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<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
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<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>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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

The presented case report is novel as it represents the first report of IML in extensor pollicis brevis. However, some of my comments are: 1) the authors need to mention the details (type and dose) of general anesthesia they have used during the surgery.    2) Any adverse events during or after post surgery recovery process should be reported. 3) Is there any infiltration of these lipoma cells to other body muscles/tissues/organs? Any test done?



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 81259

**Title:** Recurrent intramuscular lipoma at extensor pollicis brevis: A case report and literature review

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 06459703

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

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

**Author's Country/Territory:** South Korea

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-11-01

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-12-01 22:34

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-12-09 23:32

**Review time:** 8 Days

<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>Novelty of this manuscript</b>	<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
<b>Creativity or innovation of this manuscript</b>	<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



<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<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
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

This case report is well structured overall, and it was found that it adds to current knowledge. However, there are some shortcomings and questions. Abstract 1. It is stated, "Recurrent IMLs, especially those with unclear boundaries, need complete excision to differentiate it from sarcoma". Please evaluate, is it correct that complete excision aims to differentiate IMLs from sarcoma? 2. It says "Several cases if IML in the hand have been reported" . It could be revised as "Several cases of IML in the hand have been reported" 3. Keywords do not fully reflect the focus of the manuscript. Use simple phrases rather than single words when necessary Introduction 1. It is stated, "However, of all IMLs, 83% are infiltrative and 17% are well-defined, which is often difficult to distinguish from surrounding tissues". The idea in this sentence is not conveyed clearly, and it seems that this sentence does not match the reference cited. 2. The sentence explaining the MRI examination has been well-written but seems less relevant to the previous sentence. Case Presentation 1. In the "History of present illness" section, please confirm whether the lump recurs on the forearm or wrist. 2. The content in the "Treatment" section does not match this subheading and is more



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](http://www.wjgnet.com)

appropriate for describing outcomes. 3. Photos regarding follow-up after 5 years are better presented in the manuscript