

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: 74648

Title: Primary renal small cell carcinoma: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05937258 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Greece

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-12-31

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-12-31 16:10

Reviewer performed review: 2021-12-31 16:15

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Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [] 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	Peer-Review: [] Anonymous [Y] Onymous



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

https://www.wjgnet.com

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Well-written article. The authors have produced the article according the criteria as designated by the journal. What would be interesting is the following the performance of a mini systematic review with literature search in Pubmed .



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: 74648

Title: Primary renal small cell carcinoma: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05040165 Position: Editorial Board Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Thailand

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-12-31

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-01-21 01:26

Reviewer performed review: 2022-01-30 15:24

Review time: 9 Days and 13 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] 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) [] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous



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

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

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors present a report of primary renal small cell carcinoma: a case report with literature review. The authors report a case of primary renal small cell carcinoma and discussed its fast-changing clinical progress, treatment process, and long-term effect. However, some of important issues need to be verified to improve your work as following. 1. Please provide summary update data of clinical manifestation, diagnosis and treatment of primary renal small cell carcinoma from the previous reports. 2. The first case of primary renal small cell carcinoma (SCC) was reported by Capella et al. in 1984. Since then, approximately 50 cases of renal SCC (including 13 cases of small cell carcinoma of the renal pelvis) have been described. (PMID: 22084805, PMID: 12627507). It is important that within the manuscript, the authors clarify the importance of this work, how it differs from and advances previously published work and how this article can benefit the field and patients in the future etc. Please also add more information from recently published research and offer a more speculative and forward-looking perspective. 3. Systematic reviews and meta-analyses are considered to be the highest quality evidence on a research topic because their study design reduces bias and produces more reliable findings. Please add evidence from recent systematic review and meta-analysis. 4. Finally, since I am not a native English user, I did not check for typo errors and grammatical errors thoroughly. This should be done by an appropriate language reviewer.