

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 71747

**Title:** Lumbar disc sequestration mimicking a tumor: Report of four cases and a literature review

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05506329

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MBBS, MD

**Professional title:** Attending Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Nepal

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-09-20

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-09-21 12:45

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-09-29 13:58

**Review time:** 8 Days and 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 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 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



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

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

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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**

Nice article. It was a pleasure reviewing the manuscript. I came out with the following suggestions which I think will help to improve the manuscript. Abstract: It is better to mention the pathological findings for each case too. While writing the case, in my opinion, it is better to complete the detail of a case (history, examination, investigations, and management) and switch to other case. To compare and contrast among the case you can later tabulate the key features of the cases. Please consider rewriting reference 25 (issue / volume missing)

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 71747

**Title:** Lumbar disc sequestration mimicking a tumor: Report of four cases and a literature review

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 06130469

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** Doctor

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Italy

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-09-20

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-09-21 09:58

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-10-04 09:42

**Review time:** 12 Days and 23 Hours

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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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 author presents 4 cases of lumbar disc sequestration mimicking a tumor and a literature review. The theme is not novel but the review describes in a more complete way this topic. Background: no information is given about the symptoms associated with this condition, how is the diagnosis can be performed, and the radiological appearance. Case presentation: Page 4 line 133: "After conservative treatment": which therapy was given? Based on the clinical symptoms why hernia was not the suspected diagnosis in the first place?and why no differential diagnosis was performed? P10 Line 274: "reviewed 23 literature reports ". When a review is performed it is mandatory to write which database was used (PUBMED?EMBASE?), from which year to which year was the review performed and the keywords used for the search. The author should add the strengths and limits of this manuscript and the future direction of the topic

## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 71747

**Title:** Lumbar disc sequestration mimicking a tumor: Report of four cases and a literature review

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 06130469

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** Doctor

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Italy

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-09-20

**Reviewer chosen by:** Yan-Xia Xing

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-01-10 19:54

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-01-10 20:17

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

statements

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

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

In my previous review, I noticed that no information is given about the symptoms associated with this condition, in this new manuscript I don't find them too. Especially in case report it is mandatory to describe each case in a complete way. I've noticed that in the text the conservative treatment used for each patient are still absent- Additionally in the discussion, a table describing the differential diagnosis should be added, including the radiological appearance and the clinical signs and symptoms and risk factor for each disease. Strengths and limits of the manuscript and the data regarding the review performed have been added clearly. New revisions are highly required.