PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 80174

Title: Giant myxofibrosarcoma of the esophagus treated by endoscopic submucosal dissection: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06225824

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Tunisia

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-11-01

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-11-02 18:11

Reviewer performed review: 2022-11-02 18:44

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Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No scientific significance
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 statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The present work is a case report of a giant Myxofibrosarcoma of esophagus resected by endoscopic submucosal dissection. The case report is well organized and the ideas are clear. However, some minor concerns should be highlighted: 1- In the discussion section, the authors should start with a brief summary of the case report, stating the main strengths and weaknesses of the work. 2- In the discussion section, it is important to determine the characteristics of myxofibrosarcoma in CT scan and MRI. Please add in the text "On computed tomography (CT), MFS present as a heterogeneous soft tissue mass. MRI is the diagnostic modality of choice. It shows a low to intermediate signal on T1-weighted MRI. On T2-weighted MRI, the solid and myxoid components show high signal intensity, with the myxoid component showing higher signal intensity similar to fluids". Please add the following reference: Beji H, Bouassida M, Chtourou MF, Zribi S, Moghri MM, Touinsi H. Myxofibrosarcoma of the abdominal wall : A case report and literature review. Int J Surg Case Rep. 2022;95:107275. Published 2022 Jun 4. doi:10.1016/j.ijscr.2022.107275 3- The authors stated "A 79-year-old male patient was admitted to our hospital for 1 week of dysphagia". It would be better to state "A

2

79-year-old male patient was admitted to our hospital for dysphagia evolving for a month." 4- The authors stated "The space of the esophagus showed stenosis, but the endoscopy still passed". It would be better to state " There was incomplete esophageal stenosis". 5- The authors stated "the patient's family strongly request endoscopic treatment" The verb should be put in the past form. "requested" 6- The authors stated " the patient discharged from the hospital a week later". It would be better to put the verb in the past "was discharged".

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 80174

Title: Giant myxofibrosarcoma of the esophagus treated by endoscopic submucosal dissection: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03604107

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Albania

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-11-01

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-11-01 15:37

Reviewer performed review: 2022-11-05 16:12

Review time: 4 Days

Scientific quality	[　] Grade A: Excellent　[　] Grade B: Very good　[　] Grade C: Good [Y] Grade D: Fair　[　] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[　] Grade A: Excellent　[　] Grade B: Good　[　] Grade C: Fair [　] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[　] Grade A: Excellent　[　] Grade B: Good　[　] Grade C: Fair [　] Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[ ] Yes [Y] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The paper has an interesting case to narrate, but it needs absolutely a thorough English editing from a native doctor. Several expressions are bizarre or wrong: And the endoscopy barely passes   3.0cm is so giant   This case report firstly describes   It is well tolerated in this patient,   At the end there is a strange sentence: Peer-review This is an interesting and rare case report and eventually needs to be published.

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No scientific significance
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) [ ] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[ ] Yes [Y] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thanks to the authors for this rare and interesting case report. The manuscript will be helpful for other clinicians facing such rare diagnosis. I have a few comments: 1. The signed consent is missing. 2. The mauscript should be written according to the Journal's specific recommendations for writing a case report with main components Introduction, Case presentation, Discussion and Conclusion-some of them are missing. 3. The manuscript needs language polishing. 4. The authors should consider adding more references