

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

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 68751

Title: Primary intracranial synovial sarcoma with hemorrhage: A case report

Reviewer's code: 05121174

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Chief Doctor, Full Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-06-08

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-06-10 18:03

Reviewer performed review: 2021-06-11 17:51

**Review time: 23 Hours** 

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
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	[ ]Yes [Y]No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous  Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568

**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com https://www.wjgnet.com

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript ID 68751 by Wang et al describe a case of primary intracranial synovial sarcoma with hemorrhage. The paper is very well written, focused, concise, with a exhaustive description of clinical, instrumental, surgical and pathology findings. Also the Discussion is complete and very well written. I have found that the Introduction lacks the citation of the main references of similar cases in literature, especially when the authors state that this is the second case in literature. Specific points: 1 Title. The title adequately reflect the topic of the manuscript. 2 Abstract. The abstract adequately summarizes the content of the manuscript. 3 Key words. The key words are adequate. 4 Background. The Introduction lacks the citation of the main references of similar cases in literature, especially when the authors state that this is the second case in literature. 5 Methods. The methods are adequate, and exhaustively reported. 6 Results. The results are very interesting especially for the rarity of the condition and also for the good quality and completeness of the approach and of the performed analysis. 7 Discussion. The Discussion interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically. 8 Illustrations and tables. The figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents. 9 Biostatistics. Not applicable. 11 References. The introduction lacks citations to support the sentences, especially when the authors state that this condition is rare and that this is the second case complicated by hemorrhage. 12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. In my opinion the manuscript is well, concisely and coherently organized and presented. 13 Research methods and reporting. Authors have prepared their manuscripts according to CARE Checklist (2013) - Case report. 14 Ethics statements. The authors did not cite Ethics Committee approval, neither the fact that the patient gave signed informed consent for procedure and also for the case and associated imaging publication. Specific Comments To Authors The authors report a rare case of primary



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568

**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

intracranial synovial sarcoma complicated by hemorrhage. The methodology and the results are very well carried out and interesting. The results are supported by adequate analysis. The quality in my opinion is very good. I found just some limitations in the introduction where the citation of appropriate references supporting the sentences (especially when the authors state that the condition described is rare and that in their opinion this is the second case in literature) are lacking. The conclusions and perspective are adequate to the content.