PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 69685

Title: Unicentric Castleman Disease was Misdiagnosed as Pancreatic Mass ---A Case Report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03537202

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Adjunct Professor, Doctor, Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-08-06

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-09-02 11:47

Reviewer performed review: 2021-09-03 10:04

Review time: 22 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Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent　[Y] Grade B: Very good　[ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair　[ ] Grade E: Do not publish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)　[ ] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision　[ ] Major revision　[ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes　[ ] No

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Authors reported a rare and interesting case of unicentric castleman disease. Spcifically, a 44-year-old female patient with a pancreatic mass and a non-conclusive imaging diagnosis is presented. So, the patient underwent surgery and the final pathological and immunohistochemical results showed that the mass was castleman disease. This case highlights when lymphadenopathy is encountered clinically, the disease should be thought of and a biopsy should be performed. It is especially important to rule out diseases with known causes first.   STATUS: ACCETTABLE FOR PUBBLICATION PENDING MINOR REVISIONS General considerations: This is a CASE REPORT article. The work is interesting, the paper is very well-written, and there are not many similar cases described in the literature about this topic.   Abstract: the abstract appropriately summarize the manuscript without discrepancies between the abstract and the remainder of the manuscript.   Keywords: adequate.   Reference: adequate. Please, make the required additions.   Paper On some aspects, the authors should address: 1)In the description of the case as well as in the corresponding figure legend, you write about the MRI findings: "The former revealed a mixed density nodule". This structural heterogeneity of which you speak of is not particularly evident, indeed it seems the opposite. Please clarify.   2)In the imaging examinations paragraph, you write: "They all came to the conclusion that the abnormal enhancement of the upper part of the pancreatic body is a solid pseudopapillary tumor or a neuroendocrine tumor". Please, provide a few more differential elements that allow to rule out the pancreatic adenocarcinoma.   3)In differential diagnosis, it would be interesting to discuss the possibility of other rarer histotypes tumors, such as NETs. Furthermore, the possibility

of synchronous tumors in the context of multiple primary malignancies (MPMs) could also be discussed. I recommend this article, which you need to discuss and cite: -Maurea S, Corvino A, Imbriaco M, Avitabile G, Mainenti P, Camera L, Galizia G, Salvatore M. Simultaneous non-functioning neuroendocrine carcinoma of the pancreas and extra-hepatic cholangiocarcinoma. A case of early diagnosis and favorable post-surgical outcome. JOP. 2011 May 6;12(3):255-8. PMID: 21546703.   4)A linguistic revision by a native speaker is recommended.   Figures: good.   Please, adjust the figure legend of the MR image as suggested.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] 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	[Y] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[ ] Yes [Y] No

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

the article is very intersting and well written