



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

ESPS manuscript NO: 25524

Title: Primary splenic lymphoma: Current diagnostic trends

Reviewer's code: 02438659

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Jin-Xin Kong

Date sent for review: 2016-03-14 16:37

Date reviewed: 2016-04-04 23:56

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a well-organized paper about the trends on diagnostic and managing of primary splenic lymphoma. There are many language errors should be revised.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

ESPS manuscript NO: 25524

Title: Primary splenic lymphoma: Current diagnostic trends

Reviewer's code: 03318637

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Jin-Xin Kong

Date sent for review: 2016-03-14 16:37

Date reviewed: 2016-03-17 02:40

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

A well organized and fairly well written review of primary splenic lymphoma. One key point that the authors was trying to make is that this type of lymphoma can present as a diagnostic challenge because of concern with splenic biopsy/FNA. They presented literature evidence to support the safety of such procedure in this type of patient and concluded that core bx/FNA is feasible with minimal morbidity and mortality. To make this clear in the paper, I suggest that the authors should restructure or rewrite the different sections with that focus so that it is make clear to the readers what points they are trying to make. As written in its present form, the paper read more like an overview of the disease than the diagnostic challenge/trend. Because the focus is on diagnosis, the section on how needle biopsy/FNA has shown to be feasible need to be expanded and elaborated. Finally, Fig 8 is a CT not an US. Need to correct. Overall, the topic is informative, but the writing need to be more focus and there should be better flow from one section to the next so that the readers understand the main point the authors are trying to make.