

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 72902

**Title:** Prostate Sclerosing Adenopathy: a Clinicopathological and Immunohistochemical Study of Twelve Patients

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 02887546

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MAMS, MBBS, PhD

**Professional title:** Dean, Doctor, Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** India

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-11-02

**Reviewer chosen by:** Qi-Gu Yao (Online Science Editor)

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-02-25 04:34

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-03-05 15:46

**Review time:** 8 Days and 11 Hours

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 Grade E: Do not publish
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

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

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Anonymous [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] No
-------------------------------------	---

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? Yes 2  
Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript?  
Yes 3 Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? Yes 4  
Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status  
and significance of the study? Yes 5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods  
(e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? Yes  
6 Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study?  
What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field?  
Yes 7 Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and  
appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically? Are the  
findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite  
manner? Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper's scientific significance  
and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently? Yes 8 Illustrations and tables. Are the  
figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the  
paper contents? Do figures require labeling with arrows, asterisks etc., better legends?  
Yes 9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? Yes 10  
Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? Yes 11 References.  
Does the manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references  
in the introduction and discussion sections? Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly  
cite and/or over-cite references? Yes 12 Quality of manuscript organization and  
presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented?  
Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate? Yes 13 Research



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

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

methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to manuscript type and the appropriate categories, as follows: (1) CARE Checklist (2013) - Case report; (2) CONSORT 2010 Statement - Clinical Trials study, Prospective study, Randomized Controlled trial, Randomized Clinical trial; (3) PRISMA 2009 Checklist - Evidence-Based Medicine, Systematic review, Meta-Analysis; (4) STROBE Statement - Case Control study, Observational study, Retrospective Cohort study; and (5) The ARRIVE Guidelines - Basic study. Did the author prepare the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting? Yes 14 Ethics statements. For all manuscripts involving human studies and/or animal experiments, author(s) must submit the related formal ethics documents that were reviewed and approved by their local ethical review committee. Did the manuscript meet the requirements of ethics? Yes

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 72902

**Title:** Prostate Sclerosing Adenopathy: a Clinicopathological and Immunohistochemical Study of Twelve Patients

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05223442

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** FICS, MD, MSc

**Professional title:** Academic Fellow, Lecturer, Senior Researcher, Surgeon

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Liberia

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-11-02

**Reviewer chosen by:** Qi-Gu Yao (Online Science Editor)

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-03-20 18:22

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-03-30 16:37

**Review time:** 9 Days and 22 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

**Peer-reviewer  
statements**

Peer-Review: [ ☐ ] Anonymous [ ☒ ] Onymous  
Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ☐ ] Yes [ ☒ ] No

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

THough sclerosing adenosis of the prostate is uncommon, the author could kindly address the following postulations scientifically during the discussson. 1. Could sclerosing adenosing be a precursor of adenocarcinoma of the prostate? 2. Even though most of the patients with sclerosing adenosis had PSA within reference range, what do the author suggest as a long term followup for these patients?