

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 75308

Title: Delayed-release oral mesalamine tablet mimicking a small jejunal gastrointestinal stromal tumor: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 00730738

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Slovenia

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2022-01-24

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-02-15 21:52

Reviewer performed review: 2022-02-20 21:46

Review time: 4 Days and 23 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

**Peer-reviewer
statements**

Peer-Review: [☒] Anonymous [☐] Onymous

Conflicts-of-Interest: [☐] Yes [☒] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an instructive case showing that enteric-coated preparations, such as delayed-release mesalamine are hyperdense on CT scan and can be possibly misdiagnosed as tumors, for example as GIST. The authors conclude that thorough investigation of the patient's medical treatment (even occasional) and a multidisciplinary review of all the images is essential to avoid misdiagnosis and unnecessary examinations. The manuscript is well written. The background and the significance of the case is well presented. In the discussion, the key points are concisely, clearly and logically highlighted. There is a mistake in the introduction stating that "Gastrointestinal stromal tumors (GISTs) are a group of mesenchymal smooth muscle tumors of the alimentary tract". GISTs are mesenchymal tumors that recapitulate the interstitial cells of Cajal lineage/differentiation. Therefore, they are not smooth muscle tumors. Smooth muscle tumors are called leiomyoma or leiomyosarcoma. I find the reference 4 unnecessary as the stage of patients renal cell carcinoma was probably taken from the documentation. Alternatively the Eighth Edition of the Tumor-Node-Metastasis Staging Classification could be cited.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 75308

Title: Delayed-release oral mesalamine tablet mimicking a small jejunal gastrointestinal stromal tumor: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03270786

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Doctor, Lecturer

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Poland

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2022-01-24

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-02-21 08:37

Reviewer performed review: 2022-03-02 11:39

Review time: 9 Days and 3 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] Anonymous [<input 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? No. It was proved that GIST is neoplastic proliferation of Cajal cells, not smooth muscle. There are many possibilities of intrainstestinal solid lesions including foreign bodies. The GIST diagnosis was careless. 5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? The authors presented a case report focusing only on pills and GIST. 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? As above. 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? No. 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? An attached CT scan is good quality. 9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? n/a 10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? n/a 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? It is correct 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? Generally yes, but in my opinion the topic as intrainestinal tumor mass has been presented shallowly. 13 Research 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? A CARE check list was attached. 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? n/a