

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-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 76729

Title: Posterior mediastinal extralobar pulmonary sequestration misdiagnosed as a

neurogenic tumor: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05937294 Position: Editorial Board Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Research Fellow

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Iran

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-03-28

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-04-01 07:31

Reviewer performed review: 2022-04-01 11:53

Review time: 4 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish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) [] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No



Baishideng **Publishing**

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

Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors reported an interesting case of posterior mediastinal extralobar pulmonary sequestration who was initially misdiagnosed as a neurogenic tumor There are a few issues that should be addressed by the authors before consideration for publication: ----- 1. The authors should explain how their findings make a difference for the readers of the World Journal of Clinical Cases? 2. Improvements to the English language within your manuscript are requested. 3. you didn't reference your claims during the introduction section. During the introduction part you should reference all the statements. You can use the foregoing article: doi: 10.1186/s12893-021-01121-6 4. The initial three paragraph of discussion are about introduce the pulmonary sequestration, its history, prevalence and the possible etiology which are actually belonged to introduction part not discussion



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-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 76729

Title: Posterior mediastinal extralobar pulmonary sequestration misdiagnosed as a

neurogenic tumor: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 04336547 Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: FACS, MBBS, MCh, MS

Professional title: Additional Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-03-28

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-04-04 03:44

Reviewer performed review: 2022-04-08 10:48

Review time: 4 Days and 7 Hours

Scientific quality	[Y] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [] 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	[]Yes [Y]No



Baishideng Publishing

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Well written scientific case report. Findings and treatment method are appropriate and valid. Good quality writing. Images are collaborative and clear. Discussion is of good standard. Helpful for clinical practice.