

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 71613

Title: Analysis of the clinical treatment of 140 patients with parathyroid adenoma:a retrospective study

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06116816

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Nurse

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-09-15

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-09-16 05:59

Reviewer performed review: 2021-09-16 08:12

Review time: 2 Hours

Scientific quality	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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>

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

1. Is there any pregnant patient in this group? 2. How to help those patients who were asymptomatic diagnose PA?

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 71613

Title: Analysis of the clinical treatment of 140 patients with parathyroid adenoma: a retrospective study

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03502517

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Colombia

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-09-15

Reviewer chosen by: Qi-Gu Yao (Online Science Editor)

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-01-03 20:33

Reviewer performed review: 2022-01-09 02:55

Review time: 5 Days and 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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

The manuscript is well written, with language and grammar accurate and appropriate. The topic is of interest considering the importance of a precise preoperative localization of PA for assuring a successful surgical treatment. I have some comments that could be considered to improve the manuscript:

1. title Respectfully I have a concern about the title. After reading the manuscript I think you made a description of the outcome of surgical treatment of PA in a cohort of 140 patients. You could consider it.
2. Abstract Its ok.
3. Key words No concern.
4. Background -Add which is the rate (in %) if failures in surgery for PA. -Add which are the current diagnostic test for PA and their diagnostic performance in terms of sensitivity, specificity and refer which is the best tool; please also review the importance of the biochemical test and which are the most relevant for the diagnostic approach of PA. -It is not clear which is the purpose of your review. Certainly you will describe the characteristics of a PA cohort, but what for? Is the focus of your review to show the surgical success rate of your cohort and compare it with the published data?.
5. Results The results reflect the characteristics of the studied cohort and are aligned to the descriptive purpose of the study. The lesion position paragraph could be improved if you add a correlation between the findings in the different diagnostic tools and the lesions position. Please describe the diagnostic performance of the different imaging tools detecting ectopic PAs.
6. Discussion Please start the discussion part with the paragraph that summarize your most relevant results. Because preoperative analysis is crucial for an accurate diagnostic approach, use your results to be compared with the written evidence and give a recommendation for studying PAs in a cost/effective setting; it is not correct to suggest to use the complete

armamentarium of imaging tools. Please add some concepts about new perspectives regarding to Choline-PET for undetected PA with the regular imaging tools. Table 3. The right term to define the results is positive detection rate; the term sensitivity implies the measure of the variables in a 2x2 table (true positives, false negatives etc)