

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568 **E-mail:** office@baishideng.com https://www.wjgnet.com

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

Manuscript NO: 90627

Title: Classificatory Updates in Verrucous and Cuniculatum Carcinomas: Insights from

the 5th Edition of WHO-IARC Head and Neck Tumor Classification

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05414634 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: MD

**Professional title:** Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

**Author's Country/Territory:** Uruguay

Manuscript submission date: 2023-12-09

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2024-01-18 15:37

Reviewer performed review: 2024-01-25 07:13

**Review time:** 6 Days and 15 Hours

	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C:
Scientific quality	Good
	[ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[ Y] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of	[Y] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair
this manuscript	[ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568 **E-mail:** office@baishideng.com https://www.wjgnet.com

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous  Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1) The manuscripts provides insights about the changes in the recent WHO book and is quite engaging 2) Although the manuscript is current and relevant, if the authors explain the reasons for the changes made or recommendations the readers would be benefitted.