

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 33364

Title: Retroperitoneal epithelioid sarcoma: A case report

Reviewer's code: 02505493

Reviewer's country: Greece

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2017-02-07

Date reviewed: 2017-02-07

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 checked="" 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. Rephrase the sentence "Final histopathological report stated the presence of retroperitoneal epithelioid sarcoma positive for cytokeratin and vimentin, negative for CD34 (Figure 4)", since CD34 staining is not shown. 2. The authors have used the abbreviation EP in introduction and discussion, instead of ES. 3. The year of publication of ref. 4 is missing.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 33364

Title: Retroperitoneal epithelioid sarcoma: A case report

Reviewer's code: 02441070

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2017-02-07

Date reviewed: 2017-02-08

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

this paper report a rare case of retroperitoneal epithelioid sarcoma, it describe the data in detail.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 33364

Title: Retroperitoneal epithelioid sarcoma: A case report

Reviewer's code: 02444931

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2017-02-07

Date reviewed: 2017-02-12

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 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 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 checked="" 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.What is EP? 2.The context of case report is too short; 3.It lacks negative controls for IHC staining in Fig 4, moreover, Fig 4c and d should be with the same magnification.Authors should also add some markers to support their finding.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 33364

Title: Retroperitoneal epithelioid sarcoma: A case report

Reviewer's code: 02457808

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2017-02-07

Date reviewed: 2017-02-13

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 type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input checked="" 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 Authors describe a rare case of retroperitoneal solid mass communicating with duodenal lumen through an opening of the duodenal posterior wall. Endoscopic pictures are very interesting but the authors should better present the case. Major points: - The case characteristics should focus on differential diagnosis between 'Proximal-type' epithelioid sarcoma and Perivascular epithelioid cell tumor. - The authors should add relevant references (Guillou L et al. American Journal of Surgical Pathology for 'Proximal-type' epithelioid sarcoma and Chen Z et al. for Perivascular epithelioid cell tumor). Minor points: - Introduction should clearly present the scientific question proposed in the manuscript. - please explain what EP means in the Discussion - please mark the lesion with arrows in Figures 1 and 2 - please check style for journal references and add the year of publication to reference 4

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

ESPS manuscript NO: 33364

Title: Retroperitoneal epithelioid sarcoma: A case report

Reviewer's code: 03476646

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2017-02-07

Date reviewed: 2017-02-21

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 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 checked="" 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		[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

The Authors describe a rare and an interesting case of Epithelioid sarcoma. However, there are some important problems that should be re-considered.