

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 74902

Title: Not all liver tumors are alike: an accidentally discovered primary hepatic leiomyosarcoma

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06230932

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Vietnam

Author's Country/Territory: Portugal

Manuscript submission date: 2022-01-10

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-01-13 00:22

Reviewer performed review: 2022-01-14 04:15

Review time: 1 Day and 3 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 Grade E: Do not publish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
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

1. First group of questions: What are the original findings of this manuscript? This is a case report study which presents a primary hepatic leiomyosarcoma (PHL) case, an extremely rare disease, treated by surgical resection. What are the new hypotheses that this study proposed? The author didn't propose any hypothesis in this abstract. However, the result of treatment which shows in the abstract can be suggestive of the hypothesis that surgical resection is an effective treatment method for PHL. What are the new phenomena that were found through experiments in this study? There is no standard treatment due to the rarity of this disease as well as its diversity of histological types. Good result obtained from surgical treatment of PHL in this abstract suggests that liver resection with tumor-free resection margin could be an effective treatment for PHL and help improve patients' survival. What are the hypotheses that were confirmed through experiments in this study? There is no hypothesis confirmed in this study.

2. Second group of questions: What are the quality and importance of this manuscript? This is a case report study, so the level of scientific evidence is weak. However, the article is still significant because of the rarity of PHL as well as the lack of data on the effectiveness of different treatment methods for this disease, including liver resection. What are the new findings of this study? The result shows that liver resection with free-tumor resection margin confirmed by histopathology and immunohistochemistry could be an effective treatment method for PHL. What are the new concepts that this study proposes? What are the new methods that this study proposed? The abstract proposes no new concepts or methods in the diagnosis of PHL. In term of treatment, the author emphasizes the role of tumor-free resection margin in improving patient's

survival time. Do the conclusions appropriately summarize the data that this study provided? Yes, the conclusions appropriately summarize the data this study provided. What are the unique insights that this study presented? This study shows that liver resection with tumor-free margin could be an effective treatment for PHL. What are the key problems in this field that this study has solved? This study contributes more data to the literature on the effectiveness of HPL treatment by liver resection. 3. Third group of questions: What are the limitations of the study and its findings? This is a case report study, so the level of scientific evidence is weak. Although the result of no sign of tumor recurrence over 2 years is promising, the abstract has several other limitations, such as: +Lack of description of resection technique used in this case. + Lack of information of the tests performed to confirm the lesion is primary. + Lack of information of the histopathological types. What are the future directions of the topic described in this manuscript? Liver resection with tumor-free resection margin could be an effective treatment for PHL and more research towards this direction is needed. What are the questions/issues that remain to be solved? This study cannot evaluate whether surgery is better or worse than other treatments. It also has not determined which patient group will benefit the most from surgical treatment. What are the questions that this study prompts for the authors to do next? Collect cases to make case series report. Collect cases in literature to make systematic review. How might this publication impact basic science and/or clinical practice? This study contributes more data to the literature on the effectiveness of HPL treatment by liver resection.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 74902

Title: Not all liver tumors are alike: an accidentally discovered primary hepatic leiomyosarcoma

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02591964

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: FACS, MBBS, MCh, MS

Professional title: Additional Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: Portugal

Manuscript submission date: 2022-01-10

Reviewer chosen by: Qi-Gu Yao (Online Science Editor)

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-01-14 09:10

Reviewer performed review: 2022-01-14 09:25

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

**Peer-reviewer
statements**

Peer-Review: ☒ Anonymous ☐ Onymous

Conflicts-of-Interest: ☐ Yes ☒ No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This case report of a case incidentally detected liver SOL with rare unusual pathology does not add to literature on the subject. Preoperative contrast MRI could have provided more information on the nature of SOL, did authors try to consider it as metastatic before contemplating resection. what was the type of surgical resection; anatomical or non anatomical.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 74902

Title: Not all liver tumors are alike: an accidentally discovered primary hepatic leiomyosarcoma

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02591964

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: FACS, MBBS, MCh, MS

Professional title: Additional Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: Portugal

Manuscript submission date: 2022-01-10

Reviewer chosen by: Yu-Lu Chen

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-01-25 05:31

Reviewer performed review: 2022-01-25 05:37

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" 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



**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>

statements

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

ACCEPTABLE NOW