

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 62146

Title: Laparoscopic uncontained power morcellation-induced dissemination of ovarian endodermal sinus tumors: A case report

Reviewer's code: 03284613

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MBChB, PhD

Professional title: Doctor, Lecturer, Surgical Oncologist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United Kingdom

Author's Country/Territory: South Korea

Manuscript submission date: 2020-12-31

Reviewer chosen by: Jin-Lei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-01-07 12:36

Reviewer performed review: 2021-01-13 15:54

Review time: 6 Days and 3 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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

See uploaded pdf.

Peer Review Comments.

This is a case report and opinion of a disseminated yolk sac tumour. The manuscript is concise and flows well. The language is appropriate. Please consider the following points below.

(a) Title: Appropriate and relevant.

(b) Abstract: Succint, relevant and outlines key message.

(c) Key words: Appropriate.

(d) Background: The introduction is brief and succinctly presents the key features of ESTs. It also briefly outlines issues with power morcellation. I think it requires some discussion around the carcinogenesis of EST; i.e. cell of origin, molecular features, aggressive vs indolent etc. I also think it would be beneficial to elaborate more on the issues with morcellation contained in the appropriately referenced opinion papers.

(e) Methods: N/A.

(f) Results: N/A.

(g) Discussion: The discussion and conclusion is a little brief. They both clearly highlight the key points but do not elaborate on them nor do they reference contemporary literature. Particular focus should be paid to the management of complex masses in pre-menopausal women, fertility sparing management of malignancy – especially chemoresponsive tumours, and alternative methods of morcellating adnexal and uterine masses that limit intra-operative spillage. The use of a core tip at the beginning of the article is good and appropriate.

(h) Illustrations and tables: The use of figures is good but annotation of them would be

useful for the non-specialist reader. It would also be good to include imaging from prior to the initial surgery to show that there was no evidence of disseminated disease at that point.

(i) Biostatistics: N/A

(j) Units: N/A.

(k) References: Appropriate. May require further referencing to evidence more detailed discussion in introduction and conclusion.

(l) Quality of manuscript organization and presentation: Well structured and presented. Language good – requires minimal revision. Use of CARE checklist.

(m) Research methods and reporting: CARE Checklist (2013) – used appropriately.

(n) Ethics statements: provided in manuscript. Would need to see evidence of written patient consent prior to publication.

In summary, this is a novel case that highlights the problems with the use of uncontained power morcellation. It also could highlight alternative approaches to morcellation for MIS. It could also highlight alternative approaches with regards to fertility-sparing management. It is imperative that these issues are explored and discussed within the manuscript. At that stage I think consideration could be given to publication because the case highlights an important management issue in clinical practice.