

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 80174

Title: Giant myxofibrosarcoma of the esophagus treated by endoscopic submucosal

dissection: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06225824

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Tunisia

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-11-01

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-11-02 18:11

Reviewer performed review: 2022-11-02 18:44

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish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



Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous
statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The present work is a case report of a giant Myxofibrosarcoma of esophagus resected by endoscopic submucosal dissection. The case report is well organized and the ideas are clear. However, some minor concerns should be highlighted: 1- In the discussion section, the authors should start with a brief summary of the case report, stating the main strengths and weaknesses of the work. 2- In the discussion section, it is important to determine the characteristics of myxofibrosarcoma in CT scan and MRI. Please add in the text "On computed tomography (CT), MFS present as a heterogeneous soft tissue mass. MRI is the diagnostic modality of choice. It shows a low to intermediate signal on T1-weighted MRI. On T2-weighted MRI, the solid and myxoid components show high signal intensity, with the myxoid component showing higher signal intensity similar to fluids". Please add the following reference: Beji H, Bouassida M, Chtourou MF, Zribi S, Moghri MM, Touinsi H. Myxofibrosarcoma of the abdominal wall : A case report and literature review. Int J Surg Case Rep. 2022;95:107275. Published 2022 Jun 4. doi:10.1016/j.ijscr.2022.107275 3- The authors stated "A 79-year-old male patient was admitted to our hospital for 1 week of dysphagia". It would be better to state "A 79-year-old male patient was admitted to our hospital for dysphagia evolving for a month." 4- The authors stated "The space of the esophagus showed stenosis, but the endoscopy still passed". It would be better to state " There was incomplete esophageal stenosis". 5- The authors stated "the patient's family strongly request endoscopic treatment" The verb should be put in the past form. "requested" 6- The authors stated " the patient discharged from the hospital a week later". It would be better to put the verb in the past "was discharged".



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 80174

Title: Giant myxofibrosarcoma of the esophagus treated by endoscopic submucosal

dissection: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03604107

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Albania

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-11-01

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-11-01 15:37

Reviewer performed review: 2022-11-05 16:12

Review time: 4 Days

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [Y] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[] Grade A: Priority publishing [] Grade B: Minor language polishing [Y] 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	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous
statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The paper has an interesting case to narrate, but it needs absolutely a thorough English editing from a native doctor. Several expressions are bizarre or wrong: And the endoscopy barely passes 3.0cm is so giant This case report firstly describes It is well tolerated in this patient, At the end there is a strange sentence: Peer-review This is an interesting and rare case report and eventually needs to be published.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 80174

Title: Giant myxofibrosarcoma of the esophagus treated by endoscopic submucosal

dissection: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06360634

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Staff Physician

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Bulgaria

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-11-01

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-11-06 20:24

Reviewer performed review: 2022-11-06 21:14

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) [] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[]Yes [Y]No



Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous
statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thanks to the authors for this rare and interesting case report. The manuscript will be helpful for other clinicians facing such rare diagnosis. I have a few comments: 1. The signed consent is missing. 2. The mauscript should be written according to the Journal's specific recommendations for writing a case report with main components Introduction, Case presentation, Discussion and Conclusion-some of them are missing. 3. The manuscript needs language polishing. 4. The authors should consider adding more references