

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 78517

Title: Primary hepatic angiosarcoma: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06179533

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MSc

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Turkey

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-06-30

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-06-30 12:49

Reviewer performed review: 2022-06-30 18:46

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 Grade E: Do not publish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

1 Title. The title and the manuscript I not consistent. The authors mainly emphasized CEUS findings, the title should reflect that. 2 Abstract: Conclusion is too pretentious. It is not possible to conclude that CEUS is an effective tool for angiosarcoma diagnosis. The report only presents the finding of a single case. 3 Key words. Too long and pertinent. 4 Background. Rectal cancer and syphilis detail is not necessary here. 5 Methods. N/A 6 Case summary: syphilis is active or under treatment or completely cured? Please explain clearly. The combination of syphilis, angiosarcoma, and rectal cancer is very interesting. The authors should emphasize this, and try to explain possible mechanisms, immune suppression maybe. Why did the authors performed a single phase CT examination, even though they knew that the case was possibly malignant? MRI images would be fine to present. 7 Discussion. Includes too pretentious statements, like an original study. This section should be written again, main imaging findings on CT, MRI, and ultrasound should be briefly defined. Studies about CEUS should be summarized, and similar findings of the authors should emphasized. 8 Illustrations and tables. Please read above. 9 Biostatistics. N/A 10 Units. Appropriate 11 References. Too many references for a case report, should be summarized. 12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Average-below average 13 Research methods and reporting. Appropriate 14 Ethics statements. Appropriate

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 78517

Title: Primary hepatic angiosarcoma: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06307616

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-06-30

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-07-02 11:49

Reviewer performed review: 2022-07-03 13:44

Review time: 1 Day 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 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
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous

statementsConflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [**Y**] No**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

This case reported the imaging and pathological examinations of a female patient with PHA, especially the performance on contrast-enhanced ultrasonography, which provides a certain reference value for clinical diagnosis of the disease. However, I have a few questions. 1) The background section mentioned that PHA accounts for approximately 2% of primary liver tumors, please provide literature support. 2) In the discussion section, CEUS has a high diagnostic value for PHA, whether it is possible to add some content to elaborate its diagnostic value. 3) Please check whether the full name of the abbreviation in the article is all written.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 78517

Title: Primary hepatic angiosarcoma: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06290122

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-06-30

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-07-02 01:26

Reviewer performed review: 2022-07-06 01:21

Review time: 3 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 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 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
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous

statementsConflicts-of-Interest: [☐] Yes [☒] No**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

1.The authors described a rare case with Primary hepatic angiosarcoma (PHA) and rectal cancer. You also presented the Contrast-enhanced ultrasonography (CEUS) and characteristic changes in laboratory values for PHA, which is important for the clinicians in the practice. 2.Of course, in your manuscript, you should report the treatment of the rectal cancer and whether it is one of the cause of the death for the case. 3.The paper is well written and the language quality is excellent.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 78517

Title: Primary hepatic angiosarcoma: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06179533

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MSc

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Turkey

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-06-30

Reviewer chosen by: Chen-Chen Gao

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-08-22 13:09

Reviewer performed review: 2022-08-22 14:47

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 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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I am satisfied with the revision, thank you.