

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568 **E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com https://www.wjgnet.com

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 72967

Title: Large cystic-solid pulmonary hamartoma: 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: 03659905 Position: Editorial Board Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor, Research Fellow

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Spain

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-11-04

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-11-21 08:52

Reviewer performed review: 2021-11-21 08:56

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish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	[]Yes [Y]No



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

Peer-reviewer

Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The article is very interesting, providing a rare case report about an unusual entity. Title is adequate, as well as abstract. In my personal opinion, it is necessary to reorganize the case report, avoiding different sections to make it more fluid. English language requires a minor revision



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568 **E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com https://www.wjgnet.com

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 72967

Title: Large cystic-solid pulmonary hamartoma: 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: 05749932 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Postdoctoral Fellow

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-11-04

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-11-26 03:24

Reviewer performed review: 2021-11-27 18:36

Review time: 1 Day and 15 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] 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



Baishing Publishing Baishideng

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA

Telephone: +1-925-399-1568 **E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

Peer-reviewer statements

Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

At the present time, there are a wide range of immunotherapeutic options in lung diseases. The authors should discuss if immune check point inhibitors can be used in PH using the relevant publications such as; Alfredo Tartarone, et al - 2019 - Fausto Petrelli, et al - 2021 - Monireh Mohsenzadegan, et al - 2020.



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568 **E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com https://www.wjgnet.com

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 72967

Title: Large cystic-solid pulmonary hamartoma: 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: 05820375 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Consultant Physician-Scientist, Research Associate

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United Kingdom

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-11-04

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-11-27 16:28

Reviewer performed review: 2021-12-01 15:09

Review time: 3 Days and 22 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] 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



Baishideng 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

Peer-reviewer statements

Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Guo and colleagues have written a surprisingly interesting case report on a large pulmonary hamartoma, which is less common than the typical pulmonary hamartomas. The discussion is well written and interesting as the authors linked histology findings to CT findings. There is a lot of literature on typical pulmonary hamartoma, but the aspects highlighted here by the authors are innovative. I have a few comments to further improve the article: Abstract - I suggest rephrasing the first sentence of the background as it now seems that all pulmonary hamartomas are large cystic-solid lesions that are difficult to diagnose. Intro - Line 4: I'd rather say "PH can show unusual characteristics" Case presentation - Can the authors explain what the reason was to perform a CT? In many countries, this is not done as routine examination. And for pre-operative evaluation, chest X-ray is performed. - The description of the tumor varies, sometimes irregular tumor, sometimes well-defined tumor? I looks like a rather well-defined tumor to me on CT? I would clarify that/be consistent. - Diagnostic work-up: I would say our hypothesis was... (final diagnosis after histological confirmation). It would be interesting if the authors can explain to the readers why they thought it was a benign tumor at that stage. - It would be interesting if the authors can provide a bit more information on the IHC (for example, presence of smooth muscle cells (SMA+), low proliferation rate (KI-67 <5%)...) Discussion - The authors need to check and rephrase the findings of Erber's study as this was a study of malignant neoplasms, mainly sarcomas, and did not give any information on pulmonary hamartomas.