

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 81025

Title: New trends in the surgical management of soft tissue sarcoma. The role of preoperative biopsy

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 00066723

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Netherlands

Author's Country/Territory: Greece

Manuscript submission date: 2022-10-21

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-11-08 10:51

Reviewer performed review: 2022-11-14 09:41

Review time: 5 Days and 22 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 Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<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
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

This manuscript presents an overview of the relatively rare tumor group of soft tissue sarcomas and their clinical management. Additional attention for these rare tumors is necessary to improve our understanding of the biological origins of the disease and develop more effective treatment options. As such, this is a timely review that, however, could benefit from a more in-depth discussion on new emerging techniques like liquid biopsies. See my remarks below. Major Comments: 1. Abstract - Please provide a more structured abstract. 2. Abstract - The use of liquid biopsies is mentioned briefly but their significance for sarcoma diagnosis and treatment is not sufficiently explained in the text (see e.g. Page 6, line 26-27). Please elaborate in the main text. 3. Some paragraphs consist of only a few sentences preventing easy reading. Perhaps these small paragraphs can be merged with large ones. Please check. 4. Page 5, last line - It reads "...until the opposite will be confirmed by imaging." It is unclear how the benign - malignant designation can be unequivocally confirmed on the basis of imaging alone. It seems that pathological examination of a biopsy is also necessary. Please rephrase. Similarly, can ultrasound with certainty determine whether a lesion is benign? 5. Can the authors more

clearly indicate where – in their expert opinion - steps can be made in the diagnosis, management and treatment of soft tissue sarcomas and when/how biopsies come into play. Minor Comments 1. Page 4, line 12 – The text now states “...to avoid misdiagnosis in up to 30% of cases.” better should be “...to avoid misdiagnosis which can occur in up to 30% of cases.” Please check and correct. 2. Page 5, line 3 – “...improving the results” better is “...improving the treatment”. Is that what is meant? 3. Page 5, line 18 – Does “..improved the outcome” not better reflect what the authors try to convey? Please check and correct. 4. Page 6, line 13 – “heterogenicity” should be “heterogeneity”, please correct. 5. Page 8, line 10-11 – If a frozen section for diagnosis is not recommended, what is recommended? Please specify.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 81025

Title: New trends in the surgical management of soft tissue sarcoma. The role of preoperative biopsy

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05774393

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Egypt

Author's Country/Territory: Greece

Manuscript submission date: 2022-10-21

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-12-08 11:48

Reviewer performed review: 2022-12-08 12:33

Review time: 1 Hour

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
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<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
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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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

You should mention the specificity and sensitivity of core needle indidiagnosis of STS
Precausion for obtimal core biopsy