

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 77403

Title: Myeloid sarcoma with nerve entrapment: a case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06109990

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MBChB, N/A

Professional title: Academic Research, Full Professor, Senior Editor, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Iraq

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-04-28

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-05-19 03:52

Reviewer performed review: 2022-05-19 09:40

Review time: 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 Grade E: Do not publish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
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous

statements

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Authors, Thank you for conducting a very interesting case report entitled "Myeloid sarcoma with nerve entrapment: a case report" for possible publication in the esteemed journal "World Journal of Clinical Cases". The manuscript needs major revision because of the following comments: 1. Minor editing and language corrections are necessary. 2. Title a. You missed mentioning the entrapped nerve. b. There is no running title. c. The letter "a" should be with a capital letter. 3. Abstract a. Page 1 line 26: Add the abbreviation of " Myeloid sarcoma". b. Page 2 line 1 "multiple sclerosis" Please use another term to not understand the readers that this term is a disease, not a pathological change. c. Page 2 line 1: "MRI" It is not advisable to use the abbreviation in the abstract. 4. Keywords a. You must use at least 6 keywords as per journal style. b. You should use a semicolon between the keywords instead of a comma. 5. Introduction: Please add a reference for this sentence "It is rare in the literature for MS to affect the brachial plexus and produce ulnar nerve compression symptoms." 6. Case presentation a. Page 3 line 15: please you should not start the sentence with a number. b. Page 3 lines 27-30: 1. Write the full names of the abbreviations. 2. Write the reference range of each. c. Page 3 lines 32-34: 1. Please add these X-rays as a figure. 2. Why you did do elbow X-rays only. d. "Postoperative pathological findings were as follows: lymphohaematopoietic tumour (both neuroepithelial and lymph nodes), combined with immunohistochemical staining results consistent with MS [CD3 (-), CD20 (-), CD21:FDC network (+), CD5 (-), Ki-67 (+70%), TdT (-), LCA (+), MPO (+), CD117 (+), CD34 (+)] (Figure 3-4) ." I think this belongs to the treatment rather than to the outcome and follow-up. e. Page 4 line 26: postoperative visual analogue scale (VAS) of what? Please specify. 7. Discussion a. There is no comparison with other study/s. If no similar study, you can compare similar

reported cases in other areas. b. Other reasons cause features similar to the manifestations of the presenting case. Therefore, it is necessary to discuss this issue. a. You started the discussion in the first paragraph with the prevalence and then immediately you discuss the treatment options for the MS. I think in discussing any case, the following should be followed: Prevalence of the disease, causes, clinical features, investigations, differential diagnosis, treatment, and prognosis. Therefore, this sequence is not appropriate here. b. Please avoids unnecessary repetition of what you said in the case presentation section. 8. Conclusion: Is nearly a repetition of the presenting case. Therefore, I suggest performing a truncation to be useful as a message takeaway for the clinicians in the field. 9. References: a. The writing of the references is not following the journal style. b. References 5 and 14 are similar. c. Please, you can use the below link to update your references <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/?term=Myeloid+Sarcoma&filter=years.2020-2022> 10. Figures: a. I think you can delete figure number 5. Besides, it is illogical to start the numbering with a figure number 5. b. Figures 1 and 2: 1. Please remove any data from the films. 2. It needs to use a red arrow in the sagittal section in Figure A1. 3. You should mention the arrows in the figure legend. c. Figures 3 and 4: 1. You should mention the full name of the abbreviation "MS". 2. You should add the magnification power of the slides.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 77403

Title: Myeloid sarcoma with nerve entrapment: a case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05226306

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: FACS, MBBS, MCh, MD, MNAMS

Professional title: Additional Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-04-28

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-05-30 12:50

Reviewer performed review: 2022-05-30 13:27

Review time: 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 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous

statements

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. The pt had Psoriasis. Any relevant medications (Methotrexate) which might have played a role? 2. Was a nerve muscle charting / power assessment done? 3. Was a nerve conduction study performed? 4. What is the role of sonography in retrospect? 5. Final diagnosis "Left ulnar nerve entrapment" does not reflect the other components cubital tunnel syndrome / primary ANLL 6. Fig 5 mentioned is not available. "postoperative visual analogue scale (VAS) score had decreased to 1, from 5 preoperatively (Figure 5) " 7. Conclusion can clearly state the authors' management stand (Eg : In a background ANLL with nerve entrapment features, MS to be suspected and prompt decompression can help in reversal of symptoms)

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 77403

Title: Myeloid sarcoma with nerve entrapment: a case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05464606

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Professor, Surgeon, Surgical Oncologist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Taiwan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-04-28

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-05-27 11:36

Reviewer performed review: 2022-06-05 18:54

Review time: 9 Days and 7 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" 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	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous



**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>

statements

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. The similarity rate is 15%, which is acceptable. 2. Please add “Myeloid sarcomas (MS)” in the ABSTRACT before using the abbreviation of MS. 3. There are some grammar errors in the text. Please edit the text by a native English. 4. Please have a review of similar cases with nerve entrapment by myeloid sarcoma.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 77403

Title: Myeloid sarcoma with nerve entrapment: a case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05742869

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Research Scientist, Surgeon, Surgical Oncologist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Kazakhstan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-04-28

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-05-30 04:03

Reviewer performed review: 2022-06-08 07:14

Review time: 9 Days and 3 Hours

Scientific quality	[<input checked="" type="radio"/>] Grade A: Excellent [<input type="radio"/>] Grade B: Very good [<input type="radio"/>] Grade C: Good [<input type="radio"/>] Grade D: Fair [<input type="radio"/>] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[<input checked="" type="radio"/>] Grade A: Priority publishing [<input type="radio"/>] Grade B: Minor language polishing [<input type="radio"/>] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [<input type="radio"/>] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[<input checked="" type="radio"/>] Accept (High priority) [<input type="radio"/>] Accept (General priority) [<input type="radio"/>] Minor revision [<input type="radio"/>] Major revision [<input type="radio"/>] Rejection
Re-review	[<input checked="" type="radio"/>] Yes [<input type="radio"/>] No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] Anonymous [<input type="radio"/>] Onymous

statements

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This article describes a very rare case of myeloid sarcoma with nerve entrapment. This article is of significant importance for practice and science. The purpose of the article was to demonstrate a clinical case, the authors showed all the details of the case very well. It would be good to add relevance and give similar cases and compare similar cases with the current one. Thus, it will be possible to form predictions in such patients. 1 Title. The title absolutely reflects the main subject of the manuscript 2 Abstract. The abstract reflects the clinical case 3 Key words. The key words reflects the focus of the manuscript 4 Background. The manuscript adequately describes the background, present status and significance of the study. 5 Methods. The manuscript precisely describes all methods in adequate detail. 6 Results. The research objectives were achieved. The description of such unique cases is of great importance for practitioners and scientists. 7 Discussion. The discussion section is well written. It would be good to supplement data with similar cases and compare patient outcomes. 8 Illustrations and tables. All figures is in good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents. 9 Biostatistics. The manuscript doesn't need statistics. 10 Units. All units of measurement are given in standart way. 11 References. The manuscript contains the latest, relevant sources. No self-citations found, no inappropriate literature sources. 12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. The manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented. Great style, language and presentation. 13 Research methods and reporting. The authors prepared the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting. 14 Ethics statements. The manuscript doesn't need requirements of ethics.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 77403

Title: Myeloid sarcoma with ulnar nerve entrapment: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05464606

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Professor, Surgeon, Surgical Oncologist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Taiwan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-04-28

Reviewer chosen by: Yu-Lu Chen

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-07-20 16:39

Reviewer performed review: 2022-07-20 17:30

Review time: 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
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



**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>

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors have revised the manuscript according to the suggestions.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 77403

Title: Myeloid sarcoma with ulnar nerve entrapment: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06109990

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MBChB, N/A

Professional title: Academic Research, Full Professor, Senior Editor, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Iraq

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-04-28

Reviewer chosen by: Yu-Lu Chen

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-07-20 09:26

Reviewer performed review: 2022-07-20 20:35

Review time: 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
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, You made the majority of the required changes. However, there are still some minor requirements to improve the presentation of the study. You can follow them in your revised manuscript. We advise you, in the future, to highlight your changes in yellow color in the revised manuscript to be clear for the reviewers follow them. Best regards