

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

Manuscript NO: 35164

Title: Extrapaneatic solid pseudopapillary neoplasm followed by multiple metastases:
Case report

Reviewer's code: 02941534

Reviewer's country: Turkey

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2017-06-26

Date reviewed: 2017-06-30

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1- It is an interesting case thus I read it carefully. 2- The authors should correct and check the grammar of the entire paper 3- The differential diagnosis of SPN can be added to discussion section. 4- The role and benefit of different chemotherapeutic agents can be mentioned for also pancreatic SPN.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

Manuscript NO: 35164

Title: Extrapaneatic solid pseudopapillary neoplasm followed by multiple metastases:
Case report

Reviewer's code: 02529835

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2017-06-26

Date reviewed: 2017-07-05

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This paper reports a metastatic extrapancreatic solid pseudopapillary neoplasm. This kind of case is rare. I have some specific suggestions and comments as follows: Specific comments: 1. More representative photos, especially high power H & Es of the tumor, should be provided in figure 3. Each photo should be labeled as A, B, C... individually and the ones with immunostaining should be indicated clearly. 2. Fig 2 doesn't provide additional information and can be deleted. 3. Add arrows in Fig 1 to indicate the pancreas. 4. Add arrows in Fig 4 to indicate the multiple tumors. 5. Add a reference after the first sentence in the discussion. 6. The paper needs to be polished by a native speaker. The paper is full of grammar and syntax errors that significantly decrease the quality of the paper.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

Manuscript NO: 35164

Title: Extrapaneatic solid pseudopapillary neoplasm followed by multiple metastases:
Case report

Reviewer's code: 00069105

Reviewer's country: Spain

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2017-06-26

Date reviewed: 2017-07-14

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear authors. Case is interesting and well written. Easy to read. HIPEC is a controversial treatment but I understand you tried it. I understand that first resection was a R0 resection but I think that is important to remark. Any relationship between tumor and mesocolon vessels? References are not in Vancouver style

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

Manuscript NO: 35164

Title: Extrapaneatic solid pseudopapillary neoplasm followed by multiple metastases:
Case report

Reviewer's code: 02860895

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2017-07-11

Date reviewed: 2017-07-16

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a valuable case report of extra-pancreatic solid pseudopapillary neoplasm written by Wu et al. Although the manuscript seems to be well-written, I have a couple of concerns about immunohistochemical results. 1) The positive result of CD56/NCAM means necessity of synaptophysin and chromogranin immunohistochemistry to rule out neuroendocrine neoplasms. 2) The authors emphasized the positivity of beta-catenin as one of determinants of their diagnosis. However, the important finding was not presented in the manuscript. Photomicrograph of beta-catenin should have been demonstrated.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

Manuscript NO: 35164

Title: Extrapaneatic solid pseudopapillary neoplasm followed by multiple metastases:
Case report

Reviewer's code: 00069105

Reviewer's country: Spain

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2017-09-11

Date reviewed: 2017-09-15

Review time: 4 Days

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript has improved but some changes should be done

Clean of tumor is not a english surgical term

No adjuvant therapy after First operation?

HIPEC sentence in case report is difficult to understand

Remark that HIPEC as treatment of relapse in SPN is controversial

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

Manuscript NO: 35164

Title: Extrapaneatic solid pseudopapillary neoplasm followed by multiple metastases:
Case report

Reviewer's code: 02860895

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2017-09-11

Date reviewed: 2017-09-15

Review time: 4 Days

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you for giving me a chance to check the revised manuscript.

I made some minor changes. Please have a look at an attached file.

If all these changes are allowable, I will agree with accepting it for publication.