

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 84396

Title: Chest wall osteochondroma resection with biologic acellular bovine dermal mesh reconstruction in pediatric hereditary multiple exostoses: A case report and review of literature

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03967085

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Academic Editor, Assistant Professor, Researcher

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Bulgaria

Author's Country/Territory: Saudi Arabia

Manuscript submission date: 2023-03-22

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-03-22 12:44

Reviewer performed review: 2023-03-22 12:48

Review time: 1 Hour

	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C:
Scientific quality	Good
	[] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No novelty



Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	 [] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No creativity or innovation
Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	 [] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No scientific significance
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 statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The title is informative and relevant. The references are relevant and recent. The cited sources are referenced correctly. Appropriate and key studies are included. The introduction reveals what is already known about this topic. The research question is clearly outlined. The case is well-described, the used methods methods for diagnosing and therapy are valid and reliable. The patient data is presented in an appropriate way. The illustrative materials are relevant and clearly presented. Data is discussed from different angles and placed into context without being overinterpreted. The conclusions are supported by references and own results. This paper added to what is already in the topic. The article is consistent within itself. Specific comments on weaknesses of the article and what could be improved: Major points - none Minor points 1. What would be your recommendations based on the case and the outcomes? 2. What else would you be performed if you have an option (instrumental, imaging)?



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 84396

Title: Chest wall osteochondroma resection with biologic acellular bovine dermal mesh reconstruction in pediatric hereditary multiple exostoses: A case report and review of literature Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed Peer-review model: Single blind Reviewer's code: 00723087 Position: Editorial Board Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Turkey

Author's Country/Territory: Saudi Arabia

Manuscript submission date: 2023-03-22

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-04-05 09:06

Reviewer performed review: 2023-04-18 15:54

Review time: 13 Days and 6 Hours

	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C:
Scientific quality	Good
	[] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	 [] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No novelty



Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	 [] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No creativity or innovation
Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	 [] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No scientific significance
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	[]Yes [Y]No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Author(s), Although this article covers the previous literature in detail, it does not contribute any new information. For this reason, it would be appropriate to expand the literature review and reorganize it as a review of the literature. Sincerely yours