

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 68946

Title: A rare haemolymphangioma with multiple haemangiomas of the liver in elderly woman with a history of gynecological malignancy

Reviewer's code: 02887546

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MAMS, MBBS, PhD

Professional title: Dean, Doctor, Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-06-12

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-06-12 16:18

Reviewer performed review: 2021-06-13 12:26

Review time: 20 Hours

Scientific quality	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<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
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" 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

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? The authors have presented a rare case of haemolymphangioma in liver. The paper is well written, but there are some grammatical errors, which need to be corrected. 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? The paper presents a rare presentation. 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? Nil 1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? Yes 2 Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? YES 3 Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? Yes 4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? 5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? Yes 6 Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study? What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field? Yes 7 Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately,



**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

highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically? Are the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner? Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper's scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently? Yes 8 Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents? Do figures require labeling with arrows, asterisks etc., better legends? Yes. ut the numbering is erroneous. 9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? NA 10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? Yes 11 References. Does the manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections? Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references? Yes 12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate? Yes. However, some grammatical corrections marked in the file returned may be incorporated. 13 Research methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to manuscript type and the appropriate categories, as follows: (1) CARE Checklist (2013) - Case report; (2) CONSORT 2010 Statement - Clinical Trials study, Prospective study, Randomized Controlled trial, Randomized Clinical trial; (3) PRISMA 2009 Checklist - Evidence-Based Medicine, Systematic review, Meta-Analysis; (4) STROBE Statement - Case Control study, Observational study, Retrospective Cohort study; and (5) The ARRIVE Guidelines - Basic study. Did the author prepare the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting? Yes 14 Ethics statements. For all manuscripts involving human studies and/or animal experiments, author(s) must submit the related formal ethics documents that were reviewed and approved by their local ethical review committee. Did the manuscript meet the requirements of ethics? Yes

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 68946

Title: A rare haemolymphangioma with multiple haemangiomas of the liver in elderly woman with a history of gynecological malignancy

Reviewer's code: 02997260

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Senior Researcher

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Lithuania

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-06-12

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-06-14 09:39

Reviewer performed review: 2021-06-15 08:41

Review time: 23 Hours

Scientific quality	<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
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<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
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	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

The case is been presented accurately and illustrated sufficiently. The article has been prepared in accordance with the WJCC editorial requirements. The manuscript can be accepted in the present form.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 68946

Title: A rare haemolymphangioma with multiple haemangiomas of the liver in elderly woman with a history of gynecological malignancy

Reviewer's code: 00070191

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Turkey

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-06-12

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-06-15 07:49

Reviewer performed review: 2021-06-15 12:42

Review time: 4 Hours

Scientific quality	<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
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	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

In this case report, a case of haemolymphangioma with multiple haemangiomas of the liver with a history of gynecological malignancy has been presented. My comments are as follows: 1-In the physical examination section, the authors state that “ the risk factors of history of hepatitis were initially absent three years ago “. I would like to know if these factors exist at the presentation. Since readers may pose the same question, I think the existence of these factors should be stated more clearly. 2- Obviously, the final diagnosis was made by pathological examination. So why is there not a pathologist among the authors? The findings presented in microscopic images are far from informative. In addition, macroscopy of the resection specimen or during operation should be presented with adjacent hemangioma areas. Therefore, my recommendation is to present the macroscopic and microscopic findings and the IHC findings as separate figures. 3- In the discussion, information about the tumor is in the form of a repetition of the intro. Authors should avoid these repetitions throughout the text. 4- In the last statement of the same section, it is stated that “ post-operative follow-up is necessary due to the potential recurrence or metastasis of the tumor. Does this statement indicate that haemalymphangioma may have malignant potential? This issue should be considered in more detail. In addition, the risk of malignancy should be discussed. 5- In addition, the case presented here is treated with a history of gynecological malignancy. So, can treatment affect the progression of such lesions? This issue also needs to be discussed.