

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 76256

Title: Intra-abdominal ectopic bronchogenic cyst with a mucinous neoplasm harboring a GNAS mutation: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05904643

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Japan

Manuscript submission date: 2022-03-10

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-03-12 12:19

Reviewer performed review: 2022-03-21 13:47

Review time: 9 Days and 1 Hour

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 Grade E: Do not publish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 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



**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

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

This is a good case report. intra-abdominal ectopic Bronchogenic cyst is rare and difficult to diagnose preoperatively. It is easy to be misdiagnosed and missed. It should be considered in the diagnosis of cystic masses in abdomen. This case report provides us with some experience in diagnosis and treatment.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 76256

Title: Intra-abdominal ectopic bronchogenic cyst with a mucinous neoplasm harboring a GNAS mutation: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05219083

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor, Professor, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Mexico

Author's Country/Territory: Japan

Manuscript submission date: 2022-03-10

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-03-25 02:33

Reviewer performed review: 2022-04-01 01:58

Review time: 6 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: [<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

Criteria Checklist for New Manuscript Peer-Review An intra-abdominal ectopic bronchogenic cyst with a mucinous neoplasm harboring a GNAS mutation: A case report

1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? Answer: Yes.

2 Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? Answer: Yes, only the acronym CEA in the Background section, for the first time it is used, add its meaning.

3 Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? Answer: Yes.

4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? Answer: No, the Background or Introduction are very brief, the authors must further contextualize the topic related to the case of "ectopic bronchogenic cyst".

5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? Answer: As a case report for this manuscript, the Case Presentation Section is appropriate.

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? Answer: This section does not apply.

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? Answer: The answer is YES to all these questions.

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? Answer: Yes, only in the second line of the legend of Fig. 1: to the phrase "lateral lobe of the liver" add "left", as follows: left lateral lobe of the liver. 9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? Answer: This section does not apply. 10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? Answer: 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? Answer: In relation to the References, there are 2 aspects that the authors must improve: A. The Journal accepts that all authors are mentioned in the reference. B. The name of the Journal must appear in the reference with the globally accepted abbreviations. 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? Answer: The answer to both questions is YES. 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? ANSWER: Yes, CARE Checklist (2013) - Case report. 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? ANSWER: Yes, if it does not violate the Ethics statements Manuscript Peer-Review. Specific Comments To Authors:* The criteria for



**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

writing comments include the following three features: First, what are the original findings of this manuscript? What are the new hypotheses that this study proposed? What are the new phenomena that were found through experiments in this study? What are the hypotheses that were confirmed through experiments in this study? Second, what are the quality and importance of this manuscript? What are the new findings of this study? What are the new concepts that this study proposes? What are the new methods that this study proposed? Do the conclusions appropriately summarize the data that this study provided? What are the unique insights that this study presented? What are the key problems in this field that this study has solved? Third, what are the limitations of the study and its findings? What are the future directions of the topic described in this manuscript? What are the questions/issues that remain to be solved? What are the questions that this study prompts for the authors to do next? How might this publication impact basic science and/or clinical practice? Answer: The answers to these 3 groups of questions are summarized below: This manuscript corresponds to the report of a rare and interesting clinical case, well presented, with very adequate evidence of the pathology presented by the patient.