

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 55344

Title: Giant benign phyllodes breast tumour with pulmonary nodule mimicking malignancy: A case report

Reviewer's code: 04358448

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-04-09

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-04-11 02:00

Reviewer performed review: 2020-04-24 13:11

Review time: 13 Days and 11 Hours

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 Grade E: Do not publish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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors report a case of a giant breast mass, with an incidental pulmonary nodule, which confused the diagnosis until final surgical pathology. Review of the literature identified a number of cases of giant (>20cm) phyllodes tumors and summarized into a nice table. A worthy addition to the literature, which I would accept with a few suggestions below. General Recommendations: 1. Recommend author re-review of manuscript for reviewer-noted double spaces between words, incorrect spellings (outlined below), lack of capitalization at the beginning of multiple sentences, etc. I have outlined only a few of these here a. Page 3, case summary: “diagnosise” should be changed to diagnosis b. Page 3, case summary: “conformed” should be changed to confirmed c. Page 6, imaging examinations: “firsts” should be changed to first d. Page 9, can omit the word “the”, in “...more like the cachexia” Abstract - Recommend adding to the abstract that this manuscript includes a literature review, and describe what exactly the literature review includes. Literature review - Recommend adding a statement to the Discussion section that indicates “how” your literature review identified the 20 cases... what was used (e.g. PubMed, Medline), what was required for inclusion, etc Conclusion – well written and a nice summary