

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 46325

**Title:** Primary hepatoid adenocarcinoma of the lung in Yungui Plateau, China: A case report and review of the literature

**Reviewer's code:** 00608223

**Reviewer's country:** United Kingdom

**Science editor:** Jin-Lei Wang

**Date sent for review:** 2019-02-18

**Date reviewed:** 2019-02-19

**Review time:** 9 Hours, 1 Day

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

This case report genuinely concerns a rare condition, of which little is known, hence may be interesting to the journal's readers. The literature review appeared comprehensive, and the case was adequately described, however I think there are some improvements



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

that could be made. 1. Case presentation: in the discussion there is further information on treatment given, in that the patient was said to have had 8 months of platinum based chemotherapy. This seems bizarre, if he had no lymph node or distant metastases, and treatment is aligned to normal lung adenocarcinoma treatment, where this would not normally be done. In addition the conclusion contains detail on the histology of the tumour. It would be better to move all clinical details, such as histology, staining, staging, post operative management and outcome (ie alive after 8 months) to the case discussion section. This would aid flow, and also allow justification of treatment choices made for this particular individual. There may well have been a reason for using chemo, but this was not clear at present. 2. Discussion: whilst this was comprehensive it was also difficult to follow as a result. I would favour the use of some subheadings to divide it up. The initial introductory paragraph is ok pretty much as is (see language comments later) but then sections might be considered on (1) Clinical features of HAL - this would include the table of past cases and discussion of features relative to this case, as well as paragraphs on biochemical features (eg the parts on AFP) and clinical imaging. The lung adenoca pathway would also go here; I noticed that whole body radiotherapy was mentioned as part of routine lung cancer care in the absence of metastasis, which is not the case in my country. I suggest justifying this by citing guidelines, or reviewing accuracy for China. I note that most past cases have been in China; is there a known or speculated genetic or environmental factor that might explain this? There are some other malignancies more common in the Far East (eg nasopharyngeal) and I wondered about shared aetiology (2) Mechanistic aspects of HAL -this would include the histological and embryonic elements of the discussion 3. Language - there are several instances where the sentence construction is odd, appearing like it is a list instead of full text. For example, in the opening paragraph of the discussion "Aggressive tumor that most commonly arises from the gastrointestinal tract" might be better stated 'HAL is an

aggressive tumor...'. Short sentence structure is also apparent in several places, for instance in the second paragraph of the discussion "The prognosis is closely related to the pathological stage. The clinical manifestations are non-specific." Using many short sentences gives the impression of a list again, which does not aid flow when reading. These aspects should be carefully reviewed throughout the manuscript. 4. I would favor a conclusion which summarises the literature around HAL and what this case adds, perhaps with some recommendations for future research rather than simply restating the case. For example 'In conclusion, HAL is a rare cancer, most commonly reported in [authors should describe patients], similar to the case presented here. Since pathophysiology is poorly understood case registries in countries where cases have been reported previously might be considered in order to aid research into the condition. This might include [describe types of research authors think is needed]'

#### INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

##### *Google Search:*

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

##### *BPG Search:*

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