

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 80121

**Title:** Fat-poor renal angiomyolipoma with prominent cystic degeneration: A case report and review of the literature

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 02719046

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-10-07

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-10-09 11:17

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-10-10 15:40

**Review time:** 1 Day and 4 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Judgment by peer reviewers	Does this manuscript meet the code of ethics standards? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Does this manuscript have important novelty? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Does this manuscript have important creativity or innovation?

	<input type="checkbox"/> [J31] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [J30] No Does this manuscript use reliable research methods? <input type="checkbox"/> [J41] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [J40] No Are the manuscript-accompanying data and figures authentic? <input type="checkbox"/> [J51] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [J50] No Does this manuscript make scientifically significant conclusions? <input type="checkbox"/> [J61] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [J60] No
<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<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

In this manuscript the authors report a case of Fat-poor renal angiomyolipoma with prominent cystic degeneration The title reflects the main subject of the manuscript. The Introduction is well resourced and the subject is presented very well. The abstract summarizes and reflects the work described in the manuscript. The abstract is compatible with the main text. The keywords reflect the focus of the manuscript. The histological figures (Figure 2 and 3) are inadequate and must be changed by higher quality figures with a perfect resolution The authors should add a figure illustrating the macroscopic aspect of the tumor. The references are not up-to-date. This manuscript is well-balanced. The style, language and grammar require minor revision This manuscript does not add anything new to the medical literature

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 80121

**Title:** Fat-poor renal angiomyolipoma with prominent cystic degeneration: A case report and review of the literature

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05382551

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-10-07

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-10-21 08:12

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-10-21 08:32

**Review time:** 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Judgment by peer reviewers	Does this manuscript meet the code of ethics standards? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Does this manuscript have important novelty? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Does this manuscript have important creativity or innovation?

	<input type="checkbox"/> [31] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [30] No Does this manuscript use reliable research methods? <input type="checkbox"/> [41] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [40] No Are the manuscript-accompanying data and figures authentic? <input type="checkbox"/> [51] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [50] No Does this manuscript make scientifically significant conclusions? <input type="checkbox"/> [61] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [60] No
<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 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 article is within the scope of the journal, and deals with an interesting topic. It is well written and structured. His reading is fluent. The content is original and represents an important contribution to the state of the art. However it must be improved to be accepted: a) A state of the art section should be included. b) The discussion should be expanded and improved so that the work presented is compared with other similar ones. Establishing the limitations and advantages. References should be expanded. c) In the conclusion, the scientific contribution must be synthesized and a set of lines of future work must be established.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 80121

**Title:** Fat-poor renal angiomyolipoma with prominent cystic degeneration: A case report and review of the literature

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 06118159

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Assistant Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** United States

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-10-07

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-10-21 12:33

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-10-27 02:05

**Review time:** 5 Days and 13 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Judgment by peer reviewers	Does this manuscript meet the code of ethics standards? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Does this manuscript have important novelty? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Does this manuscript have important creativity or innovation?

	<input type="checkbox"/> [31] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [30] No Does this manuscript use reliable research methods? <input type="checkbox"/> [41] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [40] No Are the manuscript-accompanying data and figures authentic? <input type="checkbox"/> [51] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [50] No Does this manuscript make scientifically significant conclusions? <input type="checkbox"/> [61] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [60] No
<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 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

This is a case report describing a fat-poor renal angiomyolipoma with prominent cystic degeneration in a 60 year old man that was challenging to diagnose radiographically as well as intraoperatively and thus radical nephrectomy was performed and with histological/immunohistochemical evaluations was diagnosed as an angiomyolipoma. Specific comments are listed below: In the History of Present Illness section, it's not entirely clear why the patient presented. We know he had a renal mass diagnosed 5 years prior and that he had a "fall several months ago." Was the health examination report a clinic visit or imaging? Why was it done? I would recommend describing the story/timeline more clearly. In the History of Past Illness section, any clinical signs/symptoms of tuberous sclerosis? Or prior scans/imaging showing sporadic lymphangioleiomyomatosis? In the Family History section, would specify in terms of

any history of renal masses, renal cell carcinoma, angiomyolipomas, tuberous sclerosis, etc. In the Treatment section, I would elaborate. To my understanding, he underwent laparoscopic cyst deroofing and then biopsy? Was percutaneous biopsy ever considered? Was this approach taken due to high concern of malignant transformation? Was radical nephrectomy chosen due to the fact that RCC could not be ruled out? Was partial nephrectomy or nephron-sparing approach ever considered? In the Outcome/Follow Up section, was he evaluated for tuberous sclerosis complex with genetic testing or examinations otherwise? Overall I think the discussion section is quite good. I would elaborate on how sporadic AMLs are typically managed and what made this case interesting/unique. In the conclusion, in the text "However, in this case, we should note that when faced with a large cystic mass of the kidney, we cannot rule out the possibility of AML"; did you mean to say rule out the possibility of RCC? There are some ways the writing could be improved as well e.g. in the core tip can just summarize and not necessarily say too much about the case/patient per se.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 80121

**Title:** Fat-poor renal angiomyolipoma with prominent cystic degeneration: A case report and review of the literature

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 06140863

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Academic Research, Assistant Professor, Research Scientist

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-10-07

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-10-24 08:46

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-11-02 16:14

**Review time:** 9 Days and 7 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
Judgment by peer reviewers	Does this manuscript meet the code of ethics standards? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Does this manuscript have important novelty? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Does this manuscript have important creativity or innovation?



	<input type="checkbox"/> [31] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [30] No Does this manuscript use reliable research methods? <input type="checkbox"/> [41] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [40] No Are the manuscript-accompanying data and figures authentic? <input type="checkbox"/> [51] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [50] No Does this manuscript make scientifically significant conclusions? <input type="checkbox"/> [61] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [60] No
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors have developed an interesting case report. The manuscript is coherent and well structured. In order to improve the quality of the work, I suggest enlarging the size of the arrows in Figure 1. In addition, in histology microphotographs it is essential to include the magnifications used and/or include a scale.

## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 80121

**Title:** Fat-poor renal angiomyolipoma with prominent cystic degeneration: A case report and review of the literature

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05382551

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-10-07

**Reviewer chosen by:** Jing-Jie Wang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-11-18 10:38

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-11-18 10:44

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Peer-reviewer</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous



**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>

statements

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

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

The paper can be accepted in current form

## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 80121

**Title:** Fat-poor renal angiomyolipoma with prominent cystic degeneration: A case report and review of the literature

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 06118159

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Assistant Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** United States

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-10-07

**Reviewer chosen by:** Jing-Jie Wang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-11-21 16:20

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-12-02 02:26

**Review time:** 10 Days and 10 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Peer-reviewer</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous



**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>

statements

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

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

As indicated in the text, a few grammatical revisions are needed. With those corrections, I think this can be accepted for publication.