

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

ESPS manuscript NO: 12773

Title: Reconstruction using a pedicled upper arm fillet flap after excision of a malignant peripheral nerve sheath tumor: a case report

Reviewer code: 00289416

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2014-07-25 15:54

Date reviewed: 2014-08-11 00:02

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

A well documented case of a malignant peripheral nerve sheath tumor of the scapular area treated by surgery and postoperative radiotherapy. Although the patient had a dismay clinical course and died few months after surgery and reconstruction, the case is worth publishing because of the reconstructive technique used to cover the amputated upper arm with a pedicled fillet flap.

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

ESPS manuscript NO: 12773

Title: Reconstruction using a pedicled upper arm fillet flap after excision of a malignant peripheral nerve sheath tumor: a case report

Reviewer code: 02508408

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2014-07-25 15:54

Date reviewed: 2014-08-06 13:16

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this interesting case report, the authors reported a patient with malignant peripheral nerve sheath tumor who underwent surgery with reconstruction using a pedicled upper arm fillet flap. In general, the surgical procedure performed was quite novel, the manuscript was clear and well-written, and the images provided were of high quality.

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

ESPS manuscript NO: 12773

Title: Reconstruction using a pedicled upper arm fillet flap after excision of a malignant peripheral nerve sheath tumor: a case report

Reviewer code: 02753135

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2014-07-25 15:54

Date reviewed: 2014-07-26 01:20

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The indication for such extensive surgery in a metastatic (lung) setting can be questioned. Were there liver mets? Although neo-adjuvant therapy was planned this was not administered because of "disability" and "bleeding". The authors should give more details on the circumstances of why this adjuvant therapy was not given. What is meant by bleeding? Post operatively adjuvant chemo-radiation was planned. Patient developed a large recurrence early in the post op period (< 3/12). Was patient actually given adjuvant therapy within the 3/12 period or was this delayed by wound healing. are there post op pictures?