

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 23026

**Title:** Primary extragastrointestinal stromal tumor arising in the vaginal wall: Significant clinicopathologic characteristics of a rare aggressive soft tissue neoplasm

**Reviewer's code:** 00050420

**Reviewer's country:** South Korea

**Science editor:** Jing Yu

**Date sent for review:** 2015-11-06 09:47

**Date reviewed:** 2015-11-30 17:28

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [ Y ] Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [ Y ] No	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [ Y ] No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The author reported the "Primary extragastrointestinal stromal tumor arising in the vaginal wall: significant clinicopathologic characteristics of a rare aggressive soft tissue neoplasm". These findings are important to those with closely related research interests. It is well organized and systemically analyzed. But there are some problems in this manuscript. However, the authors should revise several critical points described below. MINOR ESSENTIAL REVISIONS in CASE REPORT 1) but the mass did not invad the bowel wall. ? -> but the mass did not invade the bowel wall. 2) about 8 cm x 7.5 cm x 5 cm in size. ? -> about 8 x 7.5 x 5 cm in size. 3) multiple hemorrhage and necrosis(Fig.1 A and B). ? -> multiple hemorrhage and necrosis(Figure 1A and B). 4) No other exons mutation were detected. ? -> Other mutation was not found. in DISCUSSION 1) spindle celled(70%), epithelioid(20%) and mixed[9]. ? -> spindle cell(70%), epithelioid(20%), and mixed [9]. 2) In general, tumors larger than 5cm in size ?-> In general, tumors larger than 5 cm in size 3) The tumor in our case was 8cm in diameter ?-> The tumor in our case was 8 cm in diameter 4) The genetic result revealed exon 11 mutation ? -> Mutational analysis revealed exon 11 mutation 5) So it could affirm



## BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

---

the diagnosis of EGIST resulting in exclusion of most of these differential diagnosis such as leiomyoma, leiomyosarcoma, neurilemmoma and so on. ?-> Comment: At present, mutational analysis is not required for the diagnosis of GISTs when the tumors have a typical histology and immunohistochemical staining pattern. The sentence does not need to be written.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 23026

**Title:** Primary extragastrointestinal stromal tumor arising in the vaginal wall: Significant clinicopathologic characteristics of a rare aggressive soft tissue neoplasm

**Reviewer's code:** 00071521

**Reviewer's country:** Italy

**Science editor:** Jing Yu

**Date sent for review:** 2015-11-06 09:47

**Date reviewed:** 2015-12-24 12:16

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

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting report of a case di rare EGIST. The presentation of case is clear and the discussion well conducted; the references are updated. However a better English edition of the text is necessary and sentence-building process should be accurately revised.