

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 76074

Title: Microcystic adnexal carcinoma misdiagnosed as a "recurrent epidermal cyst": a

case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05910457 Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MBBS, MS

Professional title: Chief Doctor, Doctor, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-02-28

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-03-01 15:17

Reviewer performed review: 2022-03-01 15:21

Review time: 1 Hour

| Scientific quality | [ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish                                  |
|--------------------|--|
| Language quality   | [ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [ Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection |
| Conclusion         | [ ] Accept (High priority) [ Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection                                  |
| Re-review          | [Y]Yes []No  |



| Peer-reviewer | Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous |
|---------------|--|
| statements    | Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [ Y] No |

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

good case but needs minor language policing



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 76074

Title: Microcystic adnexal carcinoma misdiagnosed as a "recurrent epidermal cyst": a

case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03908850 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: BSc, MD

Professional title: Doctor, Research Scientist, Staff Physician, Surgeon, Surgical

Oncologist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Russia

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-02-28

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-04-27 05:05

Reviewer performed review: 2022-05-10 17:26

**Review time:** 13 Days and 12 Hours

| Scientific quality | [ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good<br>[ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish                               |
|--------------------|--|
| Language quality   | [ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [ Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection |
| Conclusion         | [ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection                                  |



| Re-review     | [Y]Yes []No                            |
|---------------|--|
| Peer-reviewer | Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous |
| statements    | Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [ Y] No |

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you for the possibility to review the manuscript titled: "Microcystic adnexal carcinoma misdiagnosed as a "recurrent epidermal cyst": a case report". The manuscript presents an interesting case, particularly important for dermatology, oncology and surgery. Indeed, benign skin lesions are fairly common. While in some cases they turn out to be malignant, requiring different treatment. The manuscript is easy to read and there are only few minor comments: -What did the authors mean by "economic reasons" for wide excision surgery. Explain this in 1-2 sentences in the corresponding section. -Please reciew the language of the manuscript there are several type mistakes in the text. (For example in conclusion section the word "the" in the first sentence repeats itself. -Please discuss the importance of timely histological examination. It is often common for a medical facility to perform histology for all biological specimens (including benign skin lesions). The patient may have received a better treatment years ago if the skin specimen was studied histologically. Please take into account the recommendations in the spirit of improving the quality of submission.