

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 79170

Title: Hybrid Intercalated Duct Lesion of the Parotid: A Case Report and Review of Literature

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 04543416

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Chief Doctor, Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Turkey

Author's Country/Territory: Lithuania

Manuscript submission date: 2022-08-08

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-08-15 08:56

Reviewer performed review: 2022-08-15 20:51

Review time: 11 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	 [] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	 [] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No



Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous
statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This case report will contribute to the literature due to the limited number in the literature and the Hybrid Intercalated Duct Lesion that develops over the accessory parotid gland. In the presentation, it was stated that MR imaging with contrast was performed, but only a T2-weighted image was given as a figure. T1-weighted and contrast-enhanced images of the tumor should be added to the presentation, especially in order for radiologists to get to know these tumors more closely. If it has been studied, sharing the data and images of diffusion-weighted imaging will further increase the power of the case report.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 79170

Title: Hybrid Intercalated Duct Lesion of the Parotid: A Case Report and Review of Literature

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03815231

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Chief Physician, Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Lithuania

Manuscript submission date: 2022-08-08

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-08-15 04:29

Reviewer performed review: 2022-08-16 01:56

Review time: 21 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [Y] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	 [] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	 [] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No



Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous
statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this article, the authors presented a clinical case of a patient diagnosed with a hybrid intercalated duct lesion (IDL) tumor of the accessory parotid gland. they also discuss potential diagnostic pitfalls associated with unusual growth site, describe the further treatment choice, and review the available literature. My question is about the diagnosis of this case. As the authors stated in the Discussion, histologically IDH is characterized as the unencapsulated proliferation of intercalated ducts that interpose into the surrounding salivary gland parenchyma. In contrast, IDA has well defined fibrous capsule that separates them from the healthy salivary gland tissue. The hybrid pattern, as the name suggests, has both IDH and IDA structural properties. In the present case, the lesion was totally encapsulated by thin layer of fibrous tissue, as shown in Fig 3A. So, the reviewer considered it was an IDA, but not a hybrid lesion. In addition, the immunohistochemical examination need to perform and the results need to be shown.



RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases Manuscript NO: 79170 Title: Hybrid Intercalated Duct Lesion of the Parotid: A Case Report and Review of Literature Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed Peer-review model: Single blind **Reviewer's code:** 03815231 **Position:** Editorial Board Academic degree: MD, PhD Professional title: Chief Physician, Professor Reviewer's Country/Territory: China Author's Country/Territory: Lithuania Manuscript submission date: 2022-08-08 Reviewer chosen by: Xiao-Fang Liu Reviewer accepted review: 2022-09-13 06:10 Reviewer performed review: 2022-09-13 06:43

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [Y] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	 [] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous



Baishideng **Publishing**

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

The authors have explained their diagnosis of intercalated duct lesion with hybrid features. I can accept this explanation. But, I still recommended the authors to examine the expressions of some myoepithelial markers and intercalated duct marker, such as P63, SMA, SOX10, to confirm the intercalated duct differentiation.