

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 49978

Title: Peritoneal cancer arising after bilateral mastectomy, hysterectomy and bilateral salpingo oophorectomy with poor prognosis: A case report and literature review

Reviewer's code: 00894313

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's country: Greece

Author's country: China

Reviewer chosen by: Na Ma

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-08-12 18:35

Reviewer performed review: 2019-08-15 10:17

Review time: 2 Days and 15 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting case report regarding a rare case of peritoneal malignancy arising in a patient with BRCA1 mutation who was previously treated with prophylactic salpingo-oophorectomy. The literature is vague and further research is really needed for the treatment and follow up of these patients. Thus the question is original and well defined. The manuscript is written appropriately and correctly designed. Results and discussion are well presented. Language is simple and understandable, but there would be of some merit to undergo some linguistic improvement. The manuscript could be acceptable for publication after minor revision.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No