



**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>

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 87953

Title: Anlotinib in combination with pembrolizumab for low-grade myofibroblastic sarcoma of the pancreas : A case of postoperative recurrence with multiple metastases

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05242485

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-09-05

Reviewer chosen by: Yu-Lu Chen

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-10-27 17:58

Reviewer performed review: 2023-11-09 14:42

Review time: 12 Days and 20 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input 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

This is a well-written case report. I only have some minor suggestions: 1) Line 17: "It" -> "It is"? 2) Line 23: "who were" -> "which was"? 3) Line 40: "reported"->"report" 4) Line 42: "that" -> "for patients who"? 5) Line 92: "while was" -> "and"? 6) Line 121: "In a" -> "A"? 7) Lines 131–133: Did you mean the case of the current report, or the patients in the trial of Ref. 16? 8) Line 137: "is important treatment modalities" check grammar 9) Line 139: "achieved... efficacy"? suggest rephrasing 10) Line 141: "achieved certain response" -> "partially responded"? 11) Line 144: "Gelolocation"-> "Geolocation"? 12) Figure 2 caption: "in interwoven and fascicles" check grammar