

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 70040

**Title:** Multiple disciplinary team management in rare primary splenic malignancy: A case report

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 00503563

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Staff Physician

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-07-20

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-07-21 05:17

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-07-21 11:24

**Review time:** 6 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 Grade E: Do not publish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



**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>

<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
-------------------------------------	---

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

The authors reported the clinical importance of multiple disciplinary team (MDT) in rare primary splenic malignancy. There are some comments. Comments 1. In Figure 1, post-operative CT image should be deleted. 2. In case 2, pre-operative CT image should be indicated as Figure.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 70040

**Title:** Multiple disciplinary team management in rare primary splenic malignancy: A case report

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**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:** 2021-07-20

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-07-20 15:00

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-07-21 13:22

**Review time:** 22 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" 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

<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

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? Yes 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, 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? Yes Do figures require labeling with arrows, asterisks etc., better  
legends? No 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? No. Paper needs Improvement. 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 SPECIFIC QUESTION. IN THE SECOND CASE, PREOPERATIVELY MALIGNANCY WAS SUSPECTED. STILL THE AUTHORS WENT IN FOR LAP SURGERY. HOW WAS THE SPECIMEN TAKEN OUT? WHAT WAS THE CHANCE OF TUMOUR SPILLAGE? HOW WAS IT ADDRESSED.\?

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 70040

**Title:** Multiple disciplinary team management in rare primary splenic malignancy: A case report

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05523995

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Surgical Oncologist

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-07-20

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-07-21 13:24

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-07-24 02:34

**Review time:** 2 Days and 13 Hours

<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 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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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**

Kindly expound on the epidemiology of splenic malignancies, that can confirm its rarity and therefore would warrant a multidisciplinary discussion. The case summaries were elaborate and described the clinical presentation very well. Maybe, an additional review of literature on how to diagnose clinically and pathologically these rare splenic tumors can be included. The roles of each member of the MDT should also be highlighted since the manuscript basically reports the importance of an MDT.