

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 87674

Title: Granular cell tumor of the breast: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06048961

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: N/A

Professional title: N/A

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-08-21

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-08-22 00:11

Reviewer performed review: 2023-08-22 01:24

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 Grade E: Do not publish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 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

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<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
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 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

1.This is a very significant case, and there is a poor development in women, so it is of great significance to arouse widespread concern. 2.Since histology is involved in the case report, and S100 and other positive cases are also mentioned, can we show the report of this part of the immunohistochemical study? 3.Since it has been mentioned in the literature that the incidence in women is higher than that in men, and that the incidence is high between 40 and 60, is there a deeper explanation for this? 4.In the article, the author mentions that there is no other good treatment for the GCTB except surgery, including chemotherapy. Let the author further elaborate. What is the main reason why her chemotherapy is ineffective? Is there an immune escape mechanism, or is there any other reason? Is there any literature report in this regard? Please ask the author to supplement the explanation. 5.According to the literature cited by the author at the end, we can see that the 5-year survival rate of GCTB is very low and the degree of malignancy is very high. Why does this very high degree of malignancy occur? Can the author describe this aspect and provide more information, which is very helpful to readers?

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 87674

Title: Granular cell tumor of the breast: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05213310

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Adjunct Professor, Full Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Saudi Arabia

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-08-21

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-08-28 17:18

Reviewer performed review: 2023-08-28 17:42

Review time: 1 Hour

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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" 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

Dear Author(s), Please make the following changes to the article: 1/ The title of the article should be altered to be more descriptive of the study, as the title implies that the paper is a case report and literature review, but in reality, the paper is more of a case report than a review. 2/ Based on the basic criteria for writing the study's abstract, the abstract of the study requires more work than what occurred in this paper. 3/ The study's introduction is relatively brief and irrelevant to the research question in its current form. It is advised that the study introduction be rewritten in three paragraphs as follows: The first paragraph of the study introduction should express the significance of the current study, the second paragraph should express the knowledge gap that the current study seeks to fill, and the third paragraph should express what the problem of the current study is and how it can be solved within the framework of the study's goal. 4/ Are the photos from photo 1 to photo 4 truly owned by the patients in the current study, or were they obtained from other sources? I hope that if this is the case, you will protect the third party's property rights to avoid any future disputes in this area. 5/ The final paragraph of the discussion section should be updated to clarify the current

study's strengths and shortcomings, as well as the current research's future directions.
6/ The author(s) must revise the conclusion in light of whether the current study met its objectives, that is, if the current research topic was solved or not. 7/ Some references are out of date and should be updated. References from 2023 and five years prior are required. Good luck,

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 87674

Title: Granular cell tumor of the breast: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05213310

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Adjunct Professor, Full Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Saudi Arabia

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-08-21

Reviewer chosen by: Jing-Jie Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-09-27 02:06

Reviewer performed review: 2023-09-28 05:24

Review time: 1 Day and 3 Hours

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
Language quality	<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
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
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

Dear Author(s), Thank you for your efforts in responding to the reviewers' comments.

I have no further comments to share. Thanks,