

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 82290

**Title:** Primary malignant melanoma of the esophagus: Case report and literature review

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 06148636

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MBChB

**Professional title:** Surgeon

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** South Africa

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-12-18

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-12-18 11:12

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-12-23 11:09

**Review time:** 4 Days and 23 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous

statements

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

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

This neat, well-written article covering a rare, but interesting diagnosis is worthy of publication. The language is good and needs very little editing prior to publication. The case is well presented and the discussion covers all the important areas the authors set out to cover in their aims. One point to query is why the patient underwent such a large array of investigations when he was initially referred. The referring hospital thought this to be a simple haematoma or haemangioma, but the patient then underwent investigations including multiple tumour markers, D-dimer, faecal occult blood test, CT chest, abdomen and pelvis and a cranial MRI on arrival at the authors' institution. From the text it seems these were all performed prior to the repeat gastroscopy where an oesophageal melanoma was then suspected – where they perhaps done after the repeat scope once a malignancy (and not just a haemangioma)? Perhaps the authors can comment on this. I would also suggest under the History of past illness to change “The patients” to “The patient”.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 82290

**Title:** Primary malignant melanoma of the esophagus: Case report and literature review

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05077783

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, MSc

**Professional title:** Assistant Professor, Surgeon

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-12-18

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-12-18 09:41

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-12-29 02:05

**Review time:** 10 Days and 16 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous

statements

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

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

The authors report a case of primary esophageal melanoma. This is a rare condition, and is of scientific interest, as it increases physician awareness of this uncommon disease. The report is generally concise and well-written. Some corrections are necessary, such as in page 6 line 2 - "the lesion had mixed echogenicity" would better convey the meaning of this sentence. Some aspects of the report must be clarified by the authors: did the patient have any respiratory symptoms associated with pulmonary thromboembolism? Why is it described as "low to moderate risk" on the final diagnosis section? On the treatment section, it would be interesting to include information on the feeding route used on this patient, as he had significant dysphagia and weight loss. Images are of high quality and the discussion section of the manuscript is adequate for this case report.