

# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 63101

Title: Atypical granular cell tumor of the urinary bladder: A case report

Reviewer's code: 05400926

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MBBS, MS

Professional title: Surgeon, Surgical Oncologist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-03-19

Reviewer chosen by: Ya-Juan Ma

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-03-27 08:15

Reviewer performed review: 2021-03-27 17:33

Review time: 9 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ Y] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<ul> <li>[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing</li> <li>[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection</li> </ul>
Conclusion	<ul> <li>[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority)</li> <li>[ ] Minor revision [ Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection</li> </ul>
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [Y] Yes [] No



### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. Why did the woman undergo an ultrasound scan? 2. "Blood, urine and stool cultures for ova and parasites showed negative results." This statement should be modified. Blood and urine are cultured for bacteria and fungi not for ova and parasites. It should be microscopy of the urine and stool. 3. Why were the cultures performed as the first investigation? 4. Why were random tumor markers performed like CA 19.9, CA 125, AFP for urinary bladder lesion in the absence of any other evidence. Ca 199 is written wrong. 5. "semispherical neoplasm" should be written as semispherical shaped lesion. 6. "left and top wall"- it is roof not top wall. 7. Expand the abbreviation - CT scan, MRI, IHC, NSE, DFS, PET-CT 8. "soft tissue shadow", "CT value" – This is not the terminology used in CT scan reporting 9. non-mucosal origin/external pressure- Means? 10. Final diagnosis to be mentioned after treatment. 11. Why was PET-CT performed and what was done as report showed PET avid retroperitoneal lymph nodes. What was the cause. 12. Conclusion should be shortened.



# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 63101

Title: Atypical granular cell tumor of the urinary bladder: A case report

Reviewer's code: 03477988

**Position:** Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Research Associate

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Spain

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-03-19

Reviewer chosen by: Ya-Juan Ma

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-03-27 08:48

Reviewer performed review: 2021-03-28 08:30

**Review time:** 23 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<ul> <li>[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing</li> <li>[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection</li> </ul>
Conclusion	<ul> <li>[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority)</li> <li>[ ] Minor revision [ Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection</li> </ul>
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No



#### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript is interesting and the title reflect teh main subject of the manuscript. The abstract summarized the work described. Please provide high power fields of histological findings in addition to others immunohistochemical pictures. The authors should include in the discussion the differential diagnosis with other tumors with granular cell changes, for instance, leiomiosarcoma with granular cell, angiosarcomas with granular cell, melanoma etc. CD56 and SOX10 immunoreactivity is missing? CD68, inhibin, calretinin immunostain are missing



# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 63101

Title: Atypical granular cell tumor of the urinary bladder: A case report

Reviewer's code: 03815884

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Surgeon, Teaching Assistant

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Slovenia

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-03-19

Reviewer chosen by: Ya-Juan Ma

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-03-28 16:13

Reviewer performed review: 2021-03-28 20:15

Review time: 4 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<ul> <li>[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing</li> <li>[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection</li> </ul>
Conclusion	<ul> <li>[ ] Accept (High priority)</li> <li>[ ] Accept (General priority)</li> <li>[ Y] Minor revision</li> <li>[ ] Major revision</li> <li>[ ] Rejection</li> </ul>
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No



#### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The case report is very interesting and educative. You have presented a case of rare bladder tumor. The manuscript is well structured. Maybe you can add some additional information regarding patient evaluation and possible connection with anomaly (kidney genesis and uterus didelphys).



# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 63101

Title: Atypical granular cell tumor of the urinary bladder: A case report

Reviewer's code: 00183279

**Position:** Editorial Board

Academic degree: FRCS (Ed), MD, MS

Professional title: Dean, Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-03-19

Reviewer chosen by: Ya-Juan Ma

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-04-01 09:43

Reviewer performed review: 2021-04-02 15:19

**Review time:** 1 Day and 5 Hours

Scientific quality	[Y] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<ul> <li>[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing</li> <li>[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection</li> </ul>
Conclusion	<ul> <li>[ ] Accept (High priority)</li> <li>[ ] Accept (General priority)</li> <li>[ Y] Minor revision</li> <li>[ ] Major revision</li> <li>[ ] Rejection</li> </ul>
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No



#### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The paper is written very well. Some points need to be cleared. 1. There are no operative figures showing partial cystectomy. 2. While doing laparoscopic partial cystectomy, why lymph nodes were not removed as per protocol when lesion was involving muscle on preoperative imaging. 3. There is disparity in reporting about lymph nodes on PET Scan and Ct scan postoperatively. 4. Histopathology shows malignant nature of the disease, why radical cystectomy is not offered.



# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 63101

Title: Atypical granular cell tumor of the urinary bladder: A case report

Reviewer's code: 03976790

**Position:** Editorial Board

Academic degree: DSc, PhD

Professional title: Emeritus Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: France

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-03-19

Reviewer chosen by: Ya-Juan Ma

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-03-27 16:47

Reviewer performed review: 2021-04-05 08:24

Review time: 8 Days and 15 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<ul> <li>[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing</li> <li>[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection</li> </ul>
Conclusion	<ul> <li>[ ] Accept (High priority)</li> <li>[ ] Accept (General priority)</li> <li>[ Y] Minor revision</li> <li>[ ] Major revision</li> <li>[ ] Rejection</li> </ul>
Re-review	[ ]Yes [Y]No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No



#### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Comments on the manuscript: "Atypical granular cell tumor of the urinary bladder: a case report and review of the literature" Granule cell tumors are mainly localized in the head and neck, but they can be found in the urogenital tract. Granular cell tumors of the bladder are rare and usually benign. Due to this scarcity, no consensus for treatment is yet available, so it is important to describe clinical cases when they occur. In this manuscript, the authors describe one of these rare cases. This description is well done and useful. The manuscript is well written, the discussion consistent. I have only minor comments to make. Figures 2 and 3: In the legend, specify what is indicated by the arrows. Figure 4: give the magnification with a scale bar on images A and B.



# **RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT**

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 63101

Title: Atypical granular cell tumor of the urinary bladder: A case report

Reviewer's code: 05400926

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MBBS, MS

Professional title: Surgeon, Surgical Oncologist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-03-19

Reviewer chosen by: Chen-Chen Gao

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-05-20 03:50

Reviewer performed review: 2021-05-20 18:57

Review time: 15 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ Y] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<ul> <li>[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing</li> <li>[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection</li> </ul>
Conclusion	<ul> <li>[ ] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority)</li> <li>[ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection</li> </ul>
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The presentation of the article can be improved. Kindly refer to the previously oublished



case reports to get acclimitised to the language used in scientific papers.



### **RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT**

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 63101

Title: Atypical granular cell tumor of the urinary bladder: A case report

Reviewer's code: 03477988

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Research Associate

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Spain

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-03-19

Reviewer chosen by: Chen-Chen Gao

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-05-22 08:13

Reviewer performed review: 2021-05-22 08:22

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<ul> <li>[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing</li> <li>[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection</li> </ul>
Conclusion	<ul> <li>[ ] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority)</li> <li>[ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection</li> </ul>
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors have answered accordingly to the reviewer comments