

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 76013

Title: Spontaneous expulsion of a duodenal lipoma after endoscopic biopsy: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05743807

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Staff Physician

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Austria

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-03-03

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-04-07 21:12

Reviewer performed review: 2022-04-10 20:27

Review time: 2 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 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

REVIEW REPORT Title: Spontaneous disappearance of a duodenal lipoma after endoscopic biopsy: an unusual case report and literature review Article type: Case report NO: ID: 76013 Journal: WJG Date: 10.04.2022 Conflict of interest statement for peer reviewer: I declare that I do not have any competing interests. General comments: Linguistic and formatting comments: - Page 2 - to reduce invasion? What kind of invasion? Perhaps invasiveness of the procedure. Lipomas are benign and do not exhibit an invasive growth pattern. - Not all keywords are MESH indexed. - Core tip -lipomas are composed of mature adipocytes. A lipoma is not a mature lipocyte. - Also - I would suggest using the same terminology as the WHO book on soft tissues. Meaning - adipocytes and not lipocytes. - The spontaneous disappearance of the lipoma prompts us to perform a deep biopsy as a fenestration for diagnosis as well as treatment with minimal invasion and complications, particularly in cases where the lesion is relatively large or located in the small intestine. - this sentence is not entirely understandable. I believe the usage of the word “prompts” is not adequate. This “event / spontaneous disappearance of the lipoma” leads you to believe that such a course of action (deep biopsy) is most adequate. It is impossible to extrapolate a case report into a “state of the art recommendation”. - Usage of the word submucosal. Perhaps the authors should choose one term: either subepithelial or submucosal. - I believe that a histology image of the biopsy (preferably HE + sudan if there is any viable material) should be added. - Outcome and follow-up - were more biopsy samples taken? If so, what did the histologic examination show? - What happened to the patient after the 12th day? Was he immediately discharged? - I believe the authors wanted to write - with the



**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>

others arising from the tunica muscularis or in the subserosa. - I believe the readers would appreciate a graphical depiction of the different endoscopic resection techniques. - lipoma was found spontaneously disappeared - was found gone ... Or was no longer present. Also - I would perhaps add that - macroscopically the site appeared to be inflamed / or displayed signs of inflammation and scarring. Again, a histological image would be appreciated. Regarding the statement that this is the third reported case of spontaneous expulsion after biopsy ... If the authors want to keep this claim, I suggest including a search algorithm in 2 sentences (used keywords, database, for so many years, so many results). Otherwise, these claims are too vague. Some potentially useful literature: <https://www.karger.com/Article/FullText/513967>
<https://www.aapd.org/globalassets/media/publications/archives/mcdonnell-12-06.pdf>
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S174391910600104X>
<https://wjeb.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1749-7922-6-19> Opinion: Overall, I believe that the manuscript is adequately prepared and might be, after minor revisions, considered for publication. With best regards.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 76013

Title: Spontaneous expulsion of a duodenal lipoma after endoscopic biopsy: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 04025443

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Doctor, Senior Researcher

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Russia

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-03-03

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-05-13 03:31

Reviewer performed review: 2022-05-18 09:22

Review time: 5 Days and 5 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 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

I read with interest the manuscript by Zhi-hao Chen and co-authors entitled "Spontaneous disappearance of a duodenal lipoma after endoscopic biopsy: an unusual case report and literature review". The manuscript is a case-report, probably of the duodenal lipoma that spontaneously resolved after diagnostic procedure (deep biopsy). Although similar publications are present in the literature, in case the authors succeed to confirm the condition of interest (lipoma) the manuscript would be relevant to the scope of the WJG and may be interesting to the readers. To the best of my knowledge there is no consensus on the preferred treatment algorithm in such cases and accumulation of knowledge is still required. The major flaw is no proper confirmation of the condition of interest, with only indirect evidence of the lipoma. I have some minor comments, also.

1. Title: I think "disappearance" is not fully correct. The biopsy was performed and this procedure evidently lead to the described result. Please, consider changing the word to be more precise. 2. Throughout the text: please, ensure that "lipocytes" is correct. Adipocytes seems more commonly used. 3. Conclusion: Please, consider revision to be more precise. "This phenomenon" seems not suitable (may be, "this case..." is better?). The second part ("to reduce invasion and complications during treatment") is not based on the described data and needs to be confirmed in comparative trials. I suggest skipping this part of the sentence. 4. Cor tip: larger studies are necessary to make a conclusion on which treatment option is better. Probably, the choice of treatment may depend on the size, the depth and the placement of the lipoma. Lipomas are not lipocytes, but benign lesions please, revise the first sentence. The last sentence is not appropriate, as 1) the case of duodenal (only) lipoma was discussed, 2) the case can not

prompt anyone to do anything and 3) in case of relatively small size of lipoma the outcomes may be better. 5. In regard to the main complaints, the subject could have duodenal motor disorder (like functional dyspepsia) or both, functional and lipoma-related. If available, please, provide the data of contrasted X-ray examination and more details on the dependence of the symptoms on the volume of ingested food. 6. Please, provide more details on the subject's demography and anthropometry. 7. Imaging examination: please, specify that CT was performed with the use of contrast (as "without enhancement" is somewhat confusing). 8. If available, please, provide the data of histology (or, at least, stains used and the morphologist's report). In case if no confirmation by histology was obtained, there is a need for better description of the grounds for the version of lipoma. Could it be an inflammatory cyst of the duodenal mucosa (containing pus), for example? 9. Treatment: please, add details whether the subject received treatment after procedure (for example, antisecretory drugs? prokinetics?). Where the haemostatic procedures performed after the biopsy? 10. Final diagnosis is not appropriately described. Please, provide the grounds for the version of lipoma. 11. Could you, please, add more details on the patient's complaints at the follow-up? 12. Please, consider adding details on the equipment used for preparation this case (model, manufacturer, country of origin), if you suppose this relevant. 13. The format of the manuscript is not within the Journal's standards, please, revise. 14. The manuscript requires language polishing

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 76013

Title: Spontaneous expulsion of a duodenal lipoma after endoscopic biopsy: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 04025443

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Doctor, Senior Researcher

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Russia

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-03-03

Reviewer chosen by: Jing-Jie Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-07-26 10:47

Reviewer performed review: 2022-07-26 20:20

Review time: 9 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
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous

statements

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Congratulations to the authors with the great job done! The manuscript is now significantly improved. The questions raised have been appropriately answered. Please, note that there are some issues that are not related to the manuscript itself, but to the AI-driven automated system of the manuscript uploading system, that is not perfect still: Abstract: "Case summary" and "Conclusions" are identical. Please, provide the version of Conclusions as it described in the "Answering reviewers". I would suggest transferring the description given in "Final diagnosis" to "Imaging examinations" and added Duodenal lipoma (probably, with more details) to the Final diagnosis. Please, note, that a patient can hardly report bleeding, perforation, or any other complications (probably, it is better to say that these outcomes were not observed) - please, revise. Outcome and follow-up: "The patient reported milder symptoms and fewer episodes after prescription." - the phrase is senseless, please, revise or delete. Acknowledgements: please, check that all the names start with the Capitals. As there are several authors, it would be better to put down who exactly expresses the gratitude to Dr. Chen and whose husband is really beloved and thanked (however, it is none of my business, and then, please, use plural - we and our, instead)). These comments in no way diminish scientific quality of the paper and may be easily corrected.