

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 69801

Title: Huge gastric plexiform fibromyxoma presenting as pyemia by rupture of tumor: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

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: 2021-08-09

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-08-10 10:26

Reviewer performed review: 2021-08-11 14:39

Review time: 1 Day and 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 checked="" 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="radio"/>] Anonymous [<input type="radio"/>] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [<input type="radio"/>] Yes [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] No
-------------------------------------	---

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this case report, a case of PF of the stomach that manifests with rupture combined with pyremia is presented with a literature review. Basically, it is a well-written manuscript of a very rare tumor that should be considered in the differential diagnosis. Following revisions are suggested: 1. I would like to know which one of the authors performed pathological evaluation that is still the only option for correct diagnosis? This should be indicated in the author's contribution section. 2. Figure 4 should be revised because low-power microscopic figures are not enough to provide information about the histopathological findings of the lesion. Figures with higher magnification are recommended.