

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 79150

Title: Primary testicular neuroendocrine tumor with liver lymph node metastasis: A case report and review of the literature

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05909832

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-08-07

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-08-07 21:30

Reviewer performed review: 2022-08-07 22:43

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 Grade E: Do not publish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

**Peer-reviewer
statements**

Peer-Review: ☒ Anonymous ☐ Onymous

Conflicts-of-Interest: ☐ Yes ☒ No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Very interesting clinical case of a testicular neuroendocrine tumor with hepatic lymph node metastasis in a 24-year-old patient with a long history of pain and swelling in the right testicle. I have some comments and suggestions to improve the quality of the manuscript:

1. Right at the beginning of the introduction I believe that the authors mean "Neuroendocrine Tumors (NETs)" and not "Neuroendocrine Tumor (NETs)".
2. Stay in the introduction, many of the sentences are without references. Please reference all phrases.
3. In the "Chief complaints" section, I suggest replacing "was diagnosed" with "was admitted".
4. The "History of present illness" section is not well done in the article and I suggest a reformulation of it. As it is written, I cannot form the chronological history in my head, nor understand under what conditions the patient arrived at the service. With that long history (7 yrs) he was admitted to the ED? Was asked about the reason for the delay in medical care? How was the initial management of the patient and his path through the health service? Has there been any history analyzed and other previous passages by doctors for the same reason? Also, the CT and MRI exams are mentioned in this section but in my understanding they were performed after admission and therefore should not be in this section. If they were carried out before admission and in fact they are a history, they must be chronologically linked and referenced to the time of admission, that is, describe how many days after admission they were carried out.
5. I suggest that the authors insert arrows in the images that point to the findings. For the results of laboratory tests, I suggest that they be placed in a table. In addition, I believe that routine laboratory tests were carried out and are not reported, but should be for a better understanding of the case.
6. Add a little more

about the clinical rationale involved and what the patient's journey was like from admission to final diagnosis and treatment. The way it is written gives the impression that the patient went straight to imaging and laboratory tests and there was no clinical reasoning behind it. 7. In the discussion review the sentences and word constructions, some are confusing and disconnected (example: "Two types of neuroendocrine tumors, carcinoid and neuroendocrine carcinoma, have been described. A new classification method for digestive system tumors of WHO in 2010"). 8. In the discussion, differential diagnosis and treatment and prognosis sessions, many of the sentences, as well as in the introduction, are without references. Please reference. 9. In the "Treatment and prognosis" section, I believe the authors mean "Our patient..." and not "Our patients received radical orchiectomy, radiofrequency ablation...". Again, I suggest a careful review to prevent errors like this from being present in the article.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 79150

Title: Primary testicular neuroendocrine tumor with liver lymph node metastasis: A case report and review of the literature

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02719046

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Tunisia

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-08-07

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-08-07 13:01

Reviewer performed review: 2022-08-08 21:39

Review time: 1 Day and 8 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

Peer-reviewer statements	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

In this manuscript, the authors reported a case of primary testicular neuroendocrine tumor with hepatic lymph node metastasis. The authors have made a respectable effort. The title reflects the main subject of the manuscript. The abstract summarizes and reflects the work described in the manuscript. The key words reflect the focus of the manuscript. The authors should make a literature review (add a table) and state the exact number of cases of primary testicular neuroendocrine tumors reported in the literature. The authors should use the latest WHO classification of testicular tumors and use the latest grading system of neuroendocrine tumors. Figures 4 and 5 are out of focus. They must be changed by higher quality figures. The references are not current. The authors must add more recent references. The style, language and grammar are not accurate enough. We noticed the presence of several typographical mistakes. Thus, extensive English language editing is mandatory. Please avoid redundancy in the manuscript. Overall, this manuscript requires major revision.