

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 77853

Title: Clinical Characteristics and Prognosis of Orbital solitary fibrous tumor in a Chinese Tertiary Eye Hospital

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05476667

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD, PsyD

Professional title: Academic Editor, Academic Research, Research Assistant, Research Fellow

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Iran

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-05-27

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-05-27 07:51

Reviewer performed review: 2022-06-04 12:59

Review time: 8 Days and 5 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection



**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

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

. Dear authors I have now reviewed of your submission according STROBE I can see several weaknesses in the manuscript: • The critique and argument, which were too limited or not clarified thoroughly enough; • The introduction is not strong and positive The introduction is not strong and positive. The study need more explanation for rationalization. Also, Please, clearly state that what your study add to current literature. Please more explain recruitment procedure. Please, explain eligibility criteria. Data Analysis is ambiguous. Please use table to concise the results.. Discussion There are similar aspects that need to be addressed as in the Introduction. Limitations must be acknowledged. Future studies and practical implication need more attention.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 77853

Title: Clinical Characteristics and Prognosis of Orbital solitary fibrous tumor in a Chinese Tertiary Eye Hospital

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05347189

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: DNB, MBBS

Professional title: Consultant Physician-Scientist, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-05-27

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-06-12 06:42

Reviewer performed review: 2022-06-21 19:31

Review time: 9 Days and 12 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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

Key Words: Please omit 'diagnosis; treatment; prognosis' keywords from the Key Words list and add more relevant keywords. Results: Clinical Presentation: 1. The term 'exophthalmos' is specifically used to describe a different ophthalmological condition, thus please use the terminology 'proptosis' here and modify accordingly. 2. The use appropriate scientific terminology for 'eyeball dislocation'. The appropriate terminology would be 'non axial or eccentric proptosis or displacement' here, please modify accordingly. 3. Please explain what the authors want to mean by 'motility disturbances'. Please use appropriate terminologies and elaborate the same. Orbital Ultrasonography examination: 1. Please clarify how orbital vascular tumors or vascular malformations were ruled out in these '12 (92.3%) patients had abundant branching blood flow signals; 12 (92.3%) patients had small flaky blood flow signals' cases. The choice of the surgical approach: 1. Please provide the surgical approach for the cases with 'adhered to the optic nerve, compressed the lacrimal sac, spread to the brain, nasal cavity, and eyelids' in a more elaborative manner. 2. Please provide explanation regarding the reason for incomplete removal in 2 patients. 3. Please provide further details of the cases with recurrence. 4. Please provide details of post-operative complications if any, especially with the complex cases. Histopathological and immunohistochemical examination: 1. Apart from positive IHC markers, negativity for certain IHC makers (i.e. SMA, S-100) are also important to confirm the histopathological diagnosis. Please provide details regarding the same. Discussion: Please modify and rewrite the discussion part in a more concise manner. Conclusion: 1. Though radiological features are variable, few features are more consistent. Please highlight

those features. 2. Please modify the sentence regarding surgical excision and recurrence and management of the recurrence. Please give a clearer insight. 3. Please highlight the key positive and negative IHC markers. Figures: 1. Please provide few patient images (both pre and post-operative). 2. Please describe the CT features in Figure 2. 3. In Figure 3D, please provide the details of imaging, i.e. MR T1WI with CE. Other Comments: 1. 1. The authors did not mention about the reason for DOV, relevant anterior and posterior segment examination findings, relevant investigations as appropriate for diplopia, DOV etc., which are indispensable in management of these cases. 2. Please avoid using complete terminologies repeatedly throughout the article, rather use the complete terminology for the very first time with the abbreviation mentioned alongside and only use the abbreviation subsequently, i.e. IHC, HPE etc. 3. The authors need to use more scientific terminologies as appropriate throughout the article. 4. Grammatical and sentence construction errors needs to be rectified appropriately throughout the article.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 77853

Title: Clinical Characteristics and Prognosis of Orbital solitary fibrous tumor in a Chinese Tertiary Eye Hospital

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05347189

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: DNB, MBBS

Professional title: Consultant Physician-Scientist, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-05-27

Reviewer chosen by: Li-Li Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-07-29 14:17

Reviewer performed review: 2022-07-31 16:02

Review time: 2 Days and 1 Hour

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
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous

statements

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Abstract: In METHODS, please modify the sentence as 'We had conducted a retrospective, consecutive and non-comparative review of a series of patients with histopathologically confirmed diagnosis of orbital SFT treated at a single institution' or in a similar manner as mentioned above. **Results:** Please use 'restricted extraocular muscle movements' instead of 'impaired control of eye movement'. Please clarify 'lacrimal duct obstruction', whether it's 'nasolacrimal duct' or 'lacrimal canalicular' obstruction. In Orbital CT characteristics, please use 'ill-defined' instead of 'unclear' lesion boundaries. Please also describe CT characteristics of the internal part of the mass lesions apart from boundaries and Hu values. In Post-operative complications, please clarify and elaborate 'severe ocular malformation'. **Figures:** Please omit 'Notes:' from the figure legends. **Other Comments:** Please avoid using complete terminologies repeatedly throughout the article, rather use the complete terminology for the very first time with the abbreviation mentioned alongside and only use the abbreviation subsequently, i.e. IHC, HPE etc. Please revise throughout the manuscript accordingly. Grammatical and sentence construction errors needs to be rectified appropriately throughout the article.