



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 55578

Title: Gallbladder sarcomatoid carcinoma: Report of seven cases

Reviewer's code: 01047350

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor, Chief Doctor, Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate, Research Fellow, Surgeon, Surgical Oncologist, Teacher, Teaching Assistant

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Greece

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-03-25

Reviewer chosen by: Jin-Lei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-05-27 07:41

Reviewer performed review: 2020-05-29 12:05

Review time: 2 Days and 4 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 Grade E: Do not publish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	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

statements

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? YES 2. Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? YES 3. Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? YES 4. Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? YES 5. Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? YES 6. Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study? What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field? YES 7. Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically? Are the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner? Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper's scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently? YES 8. Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents? Do figures require labeling with arrows, asterisks etc., better legends? 9. Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? YES 10. Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? YES 11. References. Does the manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections? Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references? YES 12. Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate? YES 13. Research methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to manuscript



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

type and the appropriate categories, as follows: (1) CARE Checklist (2013) - Case report; (2) CONSORT 2010 Statement - Clinical Trials study, Prospective study, Randomized Controlled trial, Randomized Clinical trial; (3) PRISMA 2009 Checklist - Evidence-Based Medicine, Systematic review, Meta-Analysis; (4) STROBE Statement - Case Control study, Observational study, Retrospective Cohort study; and (5) The ARRIVE Guidelines - Basic study. Did the author prepare the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting? YES 14. Ethics statements. For all manuscripts involving human studies and/or animal experiments, author(s) must submit the related formal ethics documents that were reviewed and approved by their local ethical review committee. Did the manuscript meet the requirements of ethics? YES The present work is very interesting, well scheduled and presented. According to my opinion is interesting enough to be accepted for publication. Only minor revision is required for example ca19-9 instead of ca-199 etc. and minor language polishing in discussion section. Also conclusion should be more revised in order to present more precise in presenting basic characteristics of the disease.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 55578

Title: Gallbladder sarcomatoid carcinoma: Report of seven cases

Reviewer's code: 00722239

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-03-25

Reviewer chosen by: Jin-Lei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-05-27 06:41

Reviewer performed review: 2020-05-31 06:11

Review time: 3 Days and 23 Hours

Scientific quality	<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
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 type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" 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



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting case report summarizing seven cases of gallbladder sarcomatoid carcinoma. I know well the rarity of sarcomatoid carcinoma of the gallbladder and therefore I can understand the value of submitted paper. In addition, the submitted paper is relatively well-written. However, I can't help feeling the doubt for their pathological diagnosis within the provided information. Typical figures of sarcomatoid carcinoma is poorly differentiated carcinoma with spindle-shaped cells and commonly pleomorphic (including giant cells) morphology showing co-expression of CK and vimentin; as they described in discussion section. However, in Fig 1A, provided HE image seems to simply "poorly differentiated adenocarcinoma with desmoplastic reaction" and highlighted figures of tumor cell by PCK-IHC showed no spindle-shaped or pleomorphic morphology. In addition, IHC figures of Fig. 1c (desmin) and Fig 1d (p63) makes no sense for pathological diagnosis of sarcomatoid carcinoma. Co-expression of CK and vimentin should be demonstrated. Further, expression of p63 and squamous cell carcinoma components (documented in "Pathological diagnosis" section) indicated possibility of adenosquamous cell carcinoma; and the diagnosis of well-differentiated cases is doubtful because sarcomatoid carcinoma generally considered as poorly differentiated carcinoma. The authors should confirm the pathological diagnosis of presented seven cases. If the diagnoses of sarcomatoid carcinoma are definite, the authors should present appropriately and sufficiently the pathological findings based on the diagnosis of sarcomatoid carcinoma which are enough for persuading the readers. In discussion, first paragraph, the version of WHO classification and citation in reference should be added. Minor misspells and grammatical errors sporadically found. Please recheck it.