

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 46147

**Title:** Giant low-grade appendix mucinous neoplasm: A case report and review of the literature

**Reviewer's code:** 02445734

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-02-01 19:06

**Reviewer performed review:** 2019-02-04 19:28

**Review time:** 3 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a case report about a low-grade mucinous appendiceal neoplasm which was relatively large. Imaging findings, surgical approaches of resection, and pathological evaluation are described. Authors provide a differential diagnosis with knowledge of the

current classifications of the appendiceal mucinous neoplasms. I think these cases are rare, and a good case report is worthwhile to be published to educate the readers of the new nomenclature (since 2016 by Carr et al.) and the various modalities to arrive at a good differential diagnosis. However, the pathological discussion and the figure, demonstrating the features as why this neoplasm was called a low-grade mucinous appendiceal neoplasm, are lacking. This is surprising, since the authors state in the discussion, that the "final correct diagnosis depends on pathological evaluation". Major critique. 1) Authors fail to properly describe the histological findings in the text. 2) Authors fail to demonstrate in the figure the single epithelial layer of low grade cells without any evidence of stromal invasion, the absolute requisite to differentiate a low-grade mucinous appendiceal neoplasm from a high-grade mucinous appendiceal neoplasm or even an invasive mucinous adenocarcinoma. 3) Authors fail to demonstrate epithelial cells floating in the mucin lakes by using pankeratin immunohistochemistry. In order for this report to be published, authors must provide a proper low-power image showing the entire appendiceal wall with luminal low-grade epithelium, transmural acellular mucin, and associated serositis; as well as a high power picture of the luminal epithelium with low-grade features without cytological atypia. An pankeratin ICH must be performed to exclude epithelial cells within the mucin lakes penetrating the wall.

#### INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

##### *Google Search:*

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://** [www.wjgnet.com](https://www.wjgnet.com)

*BPG Search:*

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 46147

**Title:** Giant low-grade appendix mucinous neoplasm: A case report and review of the literature

**Reviewer's code:** 03648382

**Reviewer's country:** Turkey

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-02-02 12:18

**Reviewer performed review:** 2019-02-18 06:15

**Review time:** 15 Days and 17 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

It is well written a case report and literature review.

### INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

*Google Search:*

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

*BPG Search:*

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 46147

**Title:** Giant low-grade appendix mucinous neoplasm: A case report and review of the literature

**Reviewer's code:** 02726248

**Reviewer's country:** Egypt

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-03-08 12:02

**Reviewer performed review:** 2019-03-14 07:59

**Review time:** 5 Days and 19 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The case is well reported supported by illustrating preoperative imaging and post operative pathology with good literature review.

## INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

### *Google Search:*

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

### *BPG Search:*

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No