

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 92005

Title: Clinicopathological characteristics and typing of multilocular cystic renal neoplasm of low malignant potential

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 07906998

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Postdoctoral Fellow, Research Fellow, Researcher

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2024-01-12

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2024-01-12 06:41

Reviewer performed review: 2024-01-12 06:51

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 Grade E: Do not publish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 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" 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 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

General Comments: Dear Authors, Thank you for submitting your manuscript for review. Your study on "Multilocular Cystic Renal Neoplasm of Low Malignant Potential (MCRNLMP)" presents valuable insights into a relatively underexplored area of urological pathology. The retrospective analysis of clinicopathological data from 76 patients with MCRNLMP provides a significant contribution to the understanding of this condition. Your focus on differentiating MCRNLMP from renal cysts using CT imaging and growth rates is commendable and addresses a crucial diagnostic challenge in clinical practice. Specific Comments: Introduction: The introduction effectively establishes the significance of MCRNLMP and its differentiation from other renal conditions. However, it could be enhanced by briefly discussing the clinical implications of misdiagnosis or delayed diagnosis of MCRNLMP. Materials and Methods: The study design is well-structured, and the methodology is clearly outlined. However, it would be beneficial to include a brief discussion on the limitations of retrospective analyses and how they may impact the study's findings. Additionally, more detail on the criteria for patient selection and the rationale behind the exclusion criteria would strengthen this

section. Results: The presentation of results is comprehensive. However, consider providing a brief summary at the end of each subsection to enhance readability and comprehension. Discussion: This section successfully contextualizes the study's findings within the broader landscape of renal pathology. However, a more detailed comparison with existing literature would provide a stronger argument for the study's contributions. It would also be valuable to discuss the potential implications of these findings for clinical practice, including how they might influence treatment decisions or follow-up strategies. Conclusion: The conclusion succinctly summarizes the key findings and their significance. It might be beneficial to briefly mention potential areas for future research, particularly regarding the long-term management of patients with MCRNLMP.