

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 82236

**Title:** A case of retroperitoneal cavernous hemangioma misdiagnosed as lymphatic cyst

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05142912

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MBBS

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Saudi Arabia

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-01-29

**Reviewer chosen by:** Geng-Long Liu

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-02-14 06:04

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-02-14 06:10

**Review time:** 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="radio"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="radio"/> Grade C: Good <input type="radio"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="radio"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="radio"/> Grade B: Good <input type="radio"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="radio"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="radio"/> Grade B: Good <input type="radio"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="radio"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation



**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

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input checked="" 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
<b>Language quality</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input 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

Thank you for submitting this rare case report. It is very well written and the figures are clear.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 82236

**Title:** A case of retroperitoneal cavernous hemangioma misdiagnosed as lymphatic cyst

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 02446627

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** FACP, MD, MPhil

**Professional title:** Full Professor, Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-01-29

**Reviewer chosen by:** Geng-Long Liu

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-02-28 05:02

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-03-11 06:28

**Review time:** 11 Days and 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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

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

Nice case report. Few minor comments The pathology slides need to be described and arrow marked on the images The conclusion need to be marked out separate