

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 65465

Title: Sacral chondroblastoma—a rare location, a rare pathology: A case report and review of literature

Reviewer's code: 04149268

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MBChB, MSc

Professional title: Academic Fellow, Assistant Lecturer, Doctor, Senior Research Fellow

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Egypt

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-03-08

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-03-08 11:07

Reviewer performed review: 2021-03-09 13:10

Review time: 1 Day and 2 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 Grade E: Do not publish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

The author(s) reported a unique case of chondroblastoma located in the sacral region. The manuscript is well-written, exploring all the necessary details of diagnosis and management. CB is a rare disease that usually affects long bones. The author(s) described a unique presentation of the disease. The author(s) supported the manuscripts with sufficient references and graphical representations. Despite that, the author(s) did not provide any unique management approach for the disease. The author(s) also needs to clarify how the disease is misdiagnosed initially, as stated in the abstract. Overall, the manuscript is worth publishing only after the author(s) clarifies the 'misdiagnosis issue'.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 65465

Title: Sacral chondroblastoma—a rare location, a rare pathology: A case report and review of literature

Reviewer's code: 05684039

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Brazil

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-03-08

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-03-09 23:47

Reviewer performed review: 2021-03-13 18:22

Review time: 3 Days and 18 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" 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

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. The study demonstrates a rare presentation of a pathology, and
suggests a type of management. 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? Figure 2 could be reduced to show the abnormality more
closely. Figure 3 requires labelings. Legends of the figures are not informative. Please
insert a brief description of imaging and pathology findings. 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? References are adequate. 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? There are some grammar and spelling errors in the text. Also, I don't agree with the imaging descriptions given. 13 Research methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to manuscript 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. I'd like to thank for the opportunity to review this manuscript. The case reported is interesting, but the manuscript needs revision. My suggestions are: Please run a spell check and grammar check. There are some incorrect, repeated, and incomplete phrases in the text. For example: (page 6) "Physical examination, physical examination showed tenderness at the sacral vertebrae, normal sensory and motor function of the extremities". (page 6) "MRI showed that the sacrococcygeal abnormal signal shadow, with markedly more uniform enhancement". (In discussion) "Currently, in terms of treatment, for patients with long bone CB, high speed grinding drills for complete scraping of tumor tissue and parallel bone grafting, bone cement filling or radiofrequency ablation can make it possible to achieve good long-term local control, low recurrence rate and excellent function^{28,29}, chemical (phenol) and electrocautery or cryosurgery can also be used as adjuvant

therapy³⁰." Please insert a brief description of the imaging and pathology findings in the legends of the figures. In the Abstract (Case presentation): "A 17-year-old male with sacral CB was misdiagnosed as CB during the first surgery (...)". I think it was not a misdiagnosis. If so, please correct it. I don't agree with the description of figure 1 given in the text. I think it shows an osteolytic lesion with irregular margins and cortical breach. I don't agree with the description of figures 2 and 4 given in the text. I think they show an irregular nodular lesion, with low T1 and high T2 signal, with avid enhancement. Figure 4 shows an interval increase in the lesion with presacral extension. Could figure 2 be reduced to include only the sacrum and coccyx? I couldn't find any abnormalities in the lumbar vertebrae shown in the figures. In the discussion, "In addition, GCT and CB may be more difficult to identify if they are frequently associated with secondary ABC". Is identify the correct word here? I think "differentiate" would be a better word. In the discussion "with extensive bone destruction and extensive tissue infiltration", the word extensive is repeated. I suggest "with extensive bone destruction and tissue infiltration." In the discussion, "After contrast injection, tumor enhancement was evident, usually bordered by thin margins (less than 1 mm), and the above were similar to the imaging characteristics of our reported patients.". This phrase is a bit confusing. Could it be rephrased?

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 65465

Title: Sacral chondroblastoma—a rare location, a rare pathology: A case report and review of literature

Reviewer's code: 04149268

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MBChB, MSc

Professional title: Academic Fellow, Assistant Lecturer, Doctor, Senior Research Fellow

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Egypt

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-03-08

Reviewer chosen by: Chen-Chen Gao

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-03-29 08:29

Reviewer performed review: 2021-03-30 09:46

Review time: 1 Day and 1 Hour

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
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 have revised the manuscript and done the necessary modifications as per request from the reviewers. Therefore, I recommend publishing the manuscript in this journal.