

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 70071

**Title:** Giant schwannoma of thoracic vertebra: A case report

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 06125275

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-08-24

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-08-24 17:23

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-08-24 19:04

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous

**statements**

Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

• In line 17 page 7, there is a contradiction when the authors said that the boundaries of the tumor were unclear. And in the introduction of the article, the authors mentioned that schwannoma is a benign lesion with clear limits. • There is no indication for PET computed tomography for a benign lesion. It is not necessary to speak about it (lines 3,4 et 5 page 8). • In the room theater the quantity of bleeding was not specified. And blood transfusion was it required. • Outcome and the quality of life was not being specified with a short form score or other scoring system of the quality of life.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 70071

**Title:** Giant schwannoma of thoracic vertebra: A case report

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 06117170

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MS

**Professional title:** Doctor, Surgeon

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-08-24

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-08-25 05:51

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-09-02 17:54

**Review time:** 8 Days and 12 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" 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 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
<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</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. This case report discussed about a large schwannoma involving T5 and T6 vertebral bodies compressing upon the spinal cord and complete removal of the tumour by combined thoracic and spinal surgeons with an uneventful recovery and excellent outcome at 2 years follow up period. Removal of such a large spinal tumour without any residual neurological symptoms is commendable and it implies that the morbidity of such patients can definitely be reduced by a combined surgical approach and immediate reconstruction for spinal stabilization. This essence should be highlighted in the objective of the “Background” section of the manuscript ( Abstract, Line 3). 2. In “Introduction”, the most common site of a schwannoma should be mentioned properly as the line “ on the outside of and inside the intradural spinal- epidural spine” is not very clear (Introduction, Line 14). 3. In “Outcome and Follow up” section, it would be better if the authors mention about recovery of the patient in the immediate postoperative period. 4. Certain grammatical corrections and improvements in language throughout are required. 5. Language editing in Figure 4 legend and spelling correction in Figure 5 legend is required. Apart from these suggestions I would say that this article aiming at highlighting about the surgical management and successful outcome of a large spinal schwannoma is no doubt a good case report and will definitely enrich our literature on this topic as well as provide learning points for surgeons.