



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 67293

Title: Uterine tumor resembling an ovarian sex cord tumor: A case report and review of the literature

Reviewer's code: 06081292

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Poland

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-04-25

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-04-27 07:33

Reviewer performed review: 2021-04-27 08:49

Review time: 1 Hour

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 Grade E: Do not publish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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input 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 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



**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

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript. Comments below. 1.

INTRODUCTION: Give the clear aim of the study – why you decided to write, present and publish this case 2. **HISTORY OF PRESENT ILLNESS:** The patient presented the

„red flags“ of tumor? Did you ask/measure/assess the patient’s activity and participation limitations (see ICF classification) ? 3. **OUTCOME AND FOLLOW UP**

Please give the information about the examination performed during the follow-up visits, also how many times the patient had follow-up visits. Once again, what about the

activity and participation improvement? Any quality of life scale/questionnaire was used? 4. **DISCUSSION** „The diagnosis of UTROSCT is incredibly tough. The

symptoms might vary among patients and do not seem to be typical in some cases. Therefore, it is easy to miss or misdiagnose the disease. Common symptoms of

UTROSCT include postmenopausal bleeding (33.9%), abnormal menstruation (33.9%, menorrhagia and extended menstruation) and pelvic pain (18.6%).“ – please give the

reference(s) here „Ultrasound (US), computed tomography (CT) and magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) are useful for detecting UTROSCT.“ – please give the

referene(s) here and also (if possible) the reliability and sensitivity of these examination methods 5. **CONCLUSION** “The aim of this study was to elucidate the clinical features

of UTROSCT to avoid missing or misdiagnosing the disease in clinical practice.” – conclusion section is not the place for the describing the aim of the study