

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Oncology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 22247

**Title:** Isolated subcutaneous implantation of a borderline ovarian tumor: A case report and review of the literature

**Reviewer's code:** 02488334

**Reviewer's country:** Brazil

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2015-08-26 08:45

**Date reviewed:** 2015-09-17 19:56

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"/> 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

I have two points about this case-report: - The authors' conclusions about the port metastasis related to a fourteen years ago procedure is very speculative. - References are a bit too long.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Oncology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 22247

**Title:** Isolated subcutaneous implantation of a borderline ovarian tumor: A case report and review of the literature

**Reviewer's code:** 00074337

**Reviewer's country:** United Kingdom

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2015-08-26 08:45

**Date reviewed:** 2015-09-27 00:59

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

This is an interesting case report and review of the literature of port site implants in ovarian malignancy. I think it would benefit from some further histological elaboration in particular why is this tumour classified as borderline and what is the natural history of such a tumour, what are the distinctive histological features. The report would also benefit from a table to compare other series of port site implantations in gynaecology as well as in the wider literature to ascertain the exact nature of the problem and the implications. There are several grammatical errors throughout the manuscript.