

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 83586

Title: Discrepancy among microsatellite instability detection methodologies in non-colorectal cancer: Report of 3 cases

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03662809

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Brazil

Author's Country/Territory: Turkey

Manuscript submission date: 2023-02-07

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-02-17 14:04

Reviewer performed review: 2023-02-21 21:37

Review time: 4 Days and 7 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 Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The study deals with an interesting report of three cases of discordant MSI (Microsatellite Instability) results detected using different methods, and I have some comments to make. 1. I suggest the authors describe the clinical cases in paragraphs continuously without the subsections (Chief complaints, History of present illness, History of past illness, etc). Moreover, I suggest they exclude part of the report that is not essential to the understanding of the cases, such as routine blood and urine analyses or the complete physical examination. 2. The meaning of the title is based on only 3 cases, so none of the conclusions should be written at that point. Therefore, I suggest the authors modify the title to be more descriptive of what they found. Example: "Discrepancy among MSI detection methodologies in non-colorectal cancer – report of three cases". 3. Which parameters of immunohistochemistry (IHC) do the author used to classify it as indeterminate? It should be better described in the manuscript. 4. Was the histological analysis performed by more than one pathologist? In order to check if they agree with themselves? 5. What led some cases to perform NGS and not PCR and vice versa? It should be better detailed in the case presentation or the discussion section. 6. In



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

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

case 2, which type of biological sample was collected to perform the PCR? If collected from a different location than the original tumor, could it have resulted differently? Along the same line, the sample collection for performing IHC and NGS of case 3 involved samples from the metastases; would that be the cause of the discrepancy between the results? Why it was not collected from the surgical specimen from the primary tumor? All these points mentioned should be included in the discussion as limitations of the study. 7. I missed figures that may show the histological findings or even the results of NGS and PCR. 8. The manuscript needs English revision. Overall, the manuscript raises an interesting topic to be published but needs a major revision to have sufficient quality to be published in this journal.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 83586

Title: Discrepancy among microsatellite instability detection methodologies in non-colorectal cancer: Report of 3 cases

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05060505

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Chief Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Turkey

Manuscript submission date: 2023-02-07

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-02-17 06:34

Reviewer performed review: 2023-02-23 01:34

Review time: 5 Days and 18 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
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
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
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Interesting study. The authors report a cholangiocellular carcinoma case revealing proficient MMR by IHC but MSI-H by liquid NGS, a cervix cancer case that was dMMR by IHC, MSS by PCR but MSI-H by NGS and an endometrium cancer case found to be pMMR by IHC but MSI-H by NGS. I recommend the authos to provide some relevant figures for these three cases.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 83586

Title: Discrepancy among microsatellite instability detection methodologies in non-colorectal cancer: Report of 3 cases

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03662809

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Brazil

Author's Country/Territory: Turkey

Manuscript submission date: 2023-02-07

Reviewer chosen by: Xiao-Fang Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-03-17 11:01

Reviewer performed review: 2023-03-17 11:43

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input 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



**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>

statements

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors revised the manuscript according to the reviewer's comments. They accepted/discussed all the comments and the manuscript has improved after revision. I uploaded a version of the manuscript with writing suggestions for the authors. I have no additional comments.