

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 61656

**Title:** Successful treatment of solitary bladder plasmacytoma: A case report and review of literature

**Reviewer's code:** 04070439

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MSc, PhD

**Professional title:** Adjunct Professor

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

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-12-31

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-04-08 17:26

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-04-08 19:22

**Review time:** 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 Grade E: Do not publish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>Language quality</b>	<input checked="" 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
<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 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



**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

## **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Following the review of the Case Report titled "Successful treatment of solitary bladder plasmacytoma: A case report and review of literature" by Jiadong Cao, Jiahua Liang, Fengdan Cai, Shusheng Wang, I recommend that it should be revised taking into account the minor changes requested (attached file). 1 Title. The title reflects the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript. 2 Abstract. The abstract summarizes and reflects the work described in the manuscript. 3 Key words. The key words reflect the focus of the manuscript. 4 Background. The manuscript adequately describes the background, presents status and significance of the study. 5 Methods. The manuscript describes methods in adequate detail. 6 Results. The research contributes for understanding of plasmacytoma, a rare neoplastic disorder that arises from B-lymphocytes. 7 Discussion. The manuscript interprets the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically. The findings and their applicability are relevant to the literature and clinical practice. 8 Illustrations and tables. The figures and tables are sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents. 9 Biostatistics. Not applicable. 10 Units. The manuscript meets the requirements of use of SI units. 11 References. The manuscript cites appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections. 12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. The manuscript is well, concisely and coherently organized and presented. Style, language, and grammar are accurate and appropriate. Please, remove hyperlinks (Case presentation, Further diagnosis and treatment, Outcome and follow-up, and Table 1). 13 Research methods and reporting. The authors have read the CARE Checklist (2016), and the manuscript was prepared and revised according to the CARE Checklist (2016). 14 Ethics statements. The patient has given her written informed consent to publish the case (including publication of images).

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 61656

**Title:** Successful treatment of solitary bladder plasmacytoma: A case report and review of literature

**Reviewer's code:** 00503929

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

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

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-12-31

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-04-08 14:30

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-04-09 22:01

**Review time:** 1 Day and 7 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input checked="" 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
<b>Language quality</b>	<input checked="" 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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input checked="" 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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

The manuscript meets the criteria for acceptance based on the Criteria checklist. My specific comments to authors, according to the criteria for writing comments are: First, what are the original findings of this manuscript? What are the new hypotheses that this study proposed? What are the new phenomena that were found through experiments in this study? What are the hypotheses that were confirmed through experiments in this study? 1a) the study describes a case of solitary intramedullary plasmacytoma in 51-old female, that was successfully treated by surgery followed by radiotherapy. 1b) the study proposes no new hypothesis, except that surgery may be very important as a complementary approach to radiotherapy. 1c) The study describes no novel phenomena since the properties of the tumor and the therapeutic response were in agreement with data from the existing literature on this rare tumor type. 1d) the study does not confirm any hypothesis, since no experiments were carried out in the study. Second, what are the quality and importance of this manuscript? What are the new findings of this study? What are the new concepts that this study proposes? What are the new methods that this study proposed? Do the conclusions appropriately summarize the data that this study provided? What are the unique insights that this study presented? What are the key problems in this field that this study has solved? 2a) This is a very well-organized, well-written, manuscript, with appropriate supporting images. The characterization of the tumor as a monoclonal population is appropriate. 2b) the study proposes that surgery may be very important in the management of this disease, alongside radiotherapy. 2c) the study proposes no new methods since immunochemical and imaging approaches were used, as in previous studies by others. 2d) the conclusions correspond strictly to the data, which are very clear. 2e) the study offers no unique insights, other than the effectiveness of the chosen treatment in this case. 2f) the study



**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>

has not solved any key issues in the field, but it has substantially enriched the literature on this rare disease with an example of successful management. Third, what are the limitations of the study and its findings? What are the future directions of the topic described in this manuscript? What are the questions/issues that remain to be solved? What are the questions that this study prompts for the authors to do next? How might this publication impact basic science and/or clinical practice? 3a) I have found no limitations in the study, which is an adequate and useful case report of a rare disease and has sampled the previously existing reports for comparison. 3b. I have no future directions to suggest, since the continuation of this study will require follow-up of this patient, as well as the appearance of novel cases. 3c. The real question is whether a beneficial effect of surgery associated with radiotherapy will be observed in further, comparable cases. 3d. The authors should follow this patient up and report at a significantly later date whether she remains disease-free. 3e. This publication is a significant contribution to both basic science and clinical practice, by adding to the store of knowledge concerning a very rare condition.