Baishideng Publishing Group

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: office@baishideng.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 88426

Title: Gastric IgG4-related disease mimicking a gastrointestinal stromal tumor in a child: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 00199533
Position: Peer Reviewer
Academic degree: MD
Professional title: Associate Professor, Chief Doctor
Reviewer's Country/Territory: Argentina
Author's Country/Territory: Taiwan

Manuscript submission date: 2023-09-24
Reviewer chosen by: Yu-Lu Chen
Reviewer accepted review: 2023-11-07 15:10
Reviewer performed review: 2023-11-07 15:33
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Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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 [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] 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: office@baishideng.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] 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) [Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] 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

In line 16 on page 3 of the manuscript it should be clarified that the "presumptive" diagnosis was GIST or in any case that the imaging diagnosis suggested a probable GIST.

Effectively stating "the diagnosis of GIST was made" and then explaining that the final diagnosis is other may be sound confusing