

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 40850

**Title:** Radiation-associated epithelial-myoepithelial carcinoma among five secondary malignancies: A case report and review of literature

**Reviewer's code:** 00209021

**Reviewer's country:** Turkey

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2018-08-22

**Date reviewed:** 2018-08-25

**Review time:** 3 Days

| SCIENTIFIC QUALITY                                | LANGUAGE QUALITY                                       | CONCLUSION   | PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS                    |
|---|--|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent       | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing  | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept                    | Peer-Review:                                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good       | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language       | (High priority)                                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous          |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good | polishing  | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair            | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of      | (General priority)                                 | Peer-reviewer's expertise on the            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not          | language polishing                                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision | topic of the manuscript:                    |
| publish   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision            | <input type="checkbox"/> Advanced           |
|   |  | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General |
|   |  |  | <input type="checkbox"/> No expertise       |
|   |  |  | Conflicts-of-Interest:                      |
|   |  |  | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes                |
|   |  |  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No      |

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

-Minor English revision is necessary. -What is the authors proposal for the occurrence of such kind of malignant tumors in the patient? -The authors should explain the important information that the case provided clearly.

## INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

### *Google Search:*

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ [Y] No

### *BPG Search:*

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ [Y] No

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 40850

**Title:** Radiation-associated epithelial-myoepithelial carcinoma among five secondary malignancies: A case report and review of literature

**Reviewer's code:** 03119183

**Reviewer's country:** China

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2018-08-22

**Date reviewed:** 2018-09-14

**Review time:** 23 Days

| SCIENTIFIC QUALITY                                | LANGUAGE QUALITY  | CONCLUSION   | PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS                      |
|---|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent       | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing       | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept                    | Peer-Review:                                  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language | (High priority)                                    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good | polishing   | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair            | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of           | (General priority)                                 | Peer-reviewer's expertise on the              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not          | language polishing  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision | topic of the manuscript:                      |
| publish   | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision            | <input type="checkbox"/> Advanced             |
|   |   | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General   |
|   |   |  | <input type="checkbox"/> No expertise         |
|   |   |  | Conflicts-of-Interest:                        |
|   |   |  | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes                  |
|   |   |  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No        |

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In the current case report, the authors described a case of a 56-year-old male patient who presented with a neck mass diagnosed as epithelial-myoepithelial carcinoma of the left submandibular gland approximately 30 years after mantle field radiation and



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,  
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://** www.wjgnet.com

chemotherapy for Hodgkin's lymphoma. Overall, the case report is well presented. Only small flaws should be modified. 1. Pay attention to the spelling and grammar and avoid errors, such as " lymphomaand underwentmantle" should be " lymphoma and underwent mantle". Too much similar errors exist.

#### **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

##### ***Google Search:***

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

##### ***BPG Search:***

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 40850

**Title:** Radiation-associated epithelial-myoepithelial carcinoma among five secondary malignancies: A case report and review of literature

**Reviewer's code:** 02955715

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2018-08-22

**Date reviewed:** 2018-09-15

**Review time:** 24 Days

| SCIENTIFIC QUALITY                                     | LANGUAGE QUALITY   | CONCLUSION   | PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS                      |
|--|--|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept                    | Peer-Review:                                  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language                 | (High priority)                                    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good                 | polishing  | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of                | (General priority)                                 | Peer-reviewer's expertise on the              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not               | language polishing   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision | topic of the manuscript:                      |
| publish  | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection                      | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision            | <input type="checkbox"/> Advanced             |
|  |  | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General   |
|  |  |  | <input type="checkbox"/> No expertise         |
|  |  |  | Conflicts-of-Interest:                        |
|  |  |  | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes                  |
|  |  |  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No        |

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Authors describe a very interesting and rare case of EMC associated with prior RT for HL. Case is well written with relevant radiology and histology images. Appropriate description of management and follow-up. I have few comments for the authors.



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,  
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://** www.wjgnet.com

Suggestions: - Cahan's criteria were proposed in 1948 for post-RT sarcoma. It has a relatively broad inclusion criteria to call a neoplasm, 'radiation-induced malignancy'. This patient had chemotherapy for HL and DLBCL before diagnosis of EMC. Establishing a casual relationship between RT and ECM is difficult given rarity of diagnosis. Should a title "Radiation- associated ECM" instead of "Radiation-induced ECM" be better? How would author respond to this? - Page 6- Please use doxorubicin and vincristine which are common terms for hydroxydaunorubicin and oncovin. - Was the brain lesion biopsied? Why WBRT + IT AraC was used instead of high-dose methotrexate for secondary CNS DLBCL? - follicular lesion of undetermined significance (FLUS) composed predominantly of Hurthle cells is technically not a malignancy. What was the final diagnosis on thyroidectomy? - Hodgkin's lymphoma is now called just "Hodgkin lymphoma" (WHO classification of lymphoid malignancies 2016)

## **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

### ***Google Search:***

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

### ***BPG Search:***

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No