

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 69971

Title: Mammary-type myofibroblastoma with infarction and atypical mitosis-a potential diagnostic pitfall: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05906308

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Spain

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-07-18

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-07-25 08:17

Reviewer performed review: 2021-08-03 11:06

Review time: 9 Days and 2 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 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

The manuscript is well, concisely and coherently presented. The title reflects the main subject of the manuscript and the abstract summarizes the work described in the manuscript. I suggest improving the Case presentation in order to describe how the follow-up to the patient was carried out. It is clear that the diagnosis of mammary-type myofibroblastoma is anatomopathological, but in the discussion, given the rarity of the case, it would be appropriate to describe the preoperative (possible imaging study) and postoperative management of this tumor (clinical and/or imaging at follow-up?). In its entirety, the manuscript is interesting for the uniqueness of the case described, and as indicated by the authors, the anatomopathological characteristics of the tumor must be taken into account in the diagnosis of mammary-type myofibroblastoma.