

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 76916

**Title:** Endometrial squamous cell carcinoma originating from the cervix: A case report and literature review

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05225153

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MSc

**Professional title:** Research Scientist

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-04-14

**Reviewer chosen by:** Dong-Mei Wang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-05-22 18:47

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-05-24 05:00

**Review time:** 1 Day and 10 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 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 checked="" type="radio"/> ] Anonymous [ <input type="radio"/> ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ <input type="radio"/> ] Yes [ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] No
-------------------------------------	---

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

I think that the manuscript is well written. I ask the Authors to read my suggestions and to include a few important facts in the introductory part of the paper. I wrote in which direction to discuss. After that the paper could be accepted for publication. What are the new hypotheses that this study proposed? What are the key problems in this field that this study has solved? How might this publication impact basic science and/or clinical practice?

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 76916

**Title:** Endometrial squamous cell carcinoma originating from the cervix: A case report and literature review

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 02440903

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Academic Research, Associate Professor, Doctor, Medical Assistant, Teacher

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-04-14

**Reviewer chosen by:** Dong-Mei Wang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-05-25 08:15

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-05-28 15:03

**Review time:** 3 Days and 6 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 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

<b>Re-review</b>	[ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] Yes [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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**

Nice manuscript. A few observations are reported below. In the text some words are not spaced. Pay attention. **IMAGING EXAMINATIONS** - "Enhanced pelvic magnetic resonance imaging confirms the findings, suggesting pyometra (fig 1) and possibly endometrial polyp or submucosal myoma." The Authors should add an MR image with the possibly endometrial polyp or submucosal myoma. **DISCUSSION** - The discussion is absolutely well written, however it seems a review or a chapter of a book rather than a compared evaluation of the present case report with the data of the literature. The Authors should correlate what they reported in the discussion with the peculiar aspect of the present case report. **FIGURES** - The Authors have to add the arrows on each figure.