Reviewer Assessment

M. Gerard et al.: Thyroid liposarcoma: a case report

Reviewers' Comments to Original Submission

Reviewer 1: Stefanou, Christos

Date received: 07-Jun-2022

Reviewer recommendation: Accept in present form

Reviewer overall scoring: Excellent

Assessment Form scores: 5 = High/Yes; 3 = Medium/Adequate; 1 = Low

| Is the subject area appropriate for the journal | 5 | | | | |
|---|---|-----|---|--|--|
| Does the title clearly reflect the paper's content? | 5 | | | | |
| Does the abstract clearly reflect the paper's content | 5 | | | | |
| Do the keywords clearly reflect the paper's content? | | 4 | | | |
| Does the introduction present the problem clearly? | 5 | | | | |
| Are the results/ conclusions justified? | 5 | | | | |
| How comprehensive and up-to-date is the subject matter presented? | 5 | | | | |
| How adequate is the data presentation? | 5 | | | | |
| Are units and terminology used correctly? | 5 | | | | |
| Is the number of cases adequate? | | | 3 | | |
| Are the experimental methods/ clinical studies adequate? | 5 | | | | |
| Is the length appropriate in relation to the content? | 5 | | | | |
| Does the reader get new insights from the article? | 5 | | | | |
| Please rate the practical significance. | 5 | | | | |
| Please rate the accuracy of methods. | | 4 | | | |
| Please rate the statistical evaluation and quality control. | | 4 | | | |
| Please rate the appropriateness of the figures and tables. | 5 | | | | |
| Please rate the appropriateness of the references. | 5 | | | | |
| Please evaluate the writing style and use of language. | 5 | | | | |
| Please judge the overall scientific quality of the manuscript. | 5 | | | | |
| Are the methods used worthy of reproduction in greater deal? | | Yes | | | |
| Would you be willing to review a revision of this manuscript? | | No | | | |

Comments to author: A very rare case report. Very well described.

Well done with the work up and the treatment.

Reviewer 2: anonymous

Date received: 29-Apr-2022

Reviewer recommendation: Return to author for minor modifications

Reviewer overall scoring: Medium

Assessment Form scores: 5 = High/Yes; 3 = Medium/Adequate; 1 = Low

| Is the subject area appropriate for the journal | | 4 | | | |
|---|-----|---|---|--|---|
| Does the title clearly reflect the paper's content? | 5 | | | | |
| Does the abstract clearly reflect the paper's content | 5 | | | | |
| Do the keywords clearly reflect the paper's content? | 5 | | | | |
| Does the introduction present the problem clearly? | 5 | | | | |
| Are the results/ conclusions justified? | | 4 | | | |
| How comprehensive and up-to-date is the subject matter presented? | | | 3 | | |
| How adequate is the data presentation? | | | 3 | | |
| Are units and terminology used correctly? | | | 3 | | |
| Is the number of cases adequate? | | | | | 1 |
| Are the experimental methods/ clinical studies adequate? | | 4 | | | |
| Is the length appropriate in relation to the content? | | 4 | | | |
| Does the reader get new insights from the article? | | | 3 | | |
| Please rate the practical significance. | | | 3 | | |
| Please rate the accuracy of methods. | | 4 | | | |
| Please rate the statistical evaluation and quality control. | | | | | 1 |
| Please rate the appropriateness of the figures and tables. | | | 3 | | |
| Please rate the appropriateness of the references. | | 4 | | | |
| Please evaluate the writing style and use of language. | | 4 | | | |
| Please judge the overall scientific quality of the manuscript. | | 4 | | | |
| Are the methods used worthy of reproduction in greater deal? | | | | | |
| Would you be willing to review a revision of this manuscript? | Yes | | | | |
| | | | | | |

Comments to author: Dear authors,

this is a nicely presented case, which is truly worthwhile to be published.

However, I have one major concern: this refers to the histology. You describe that the sarcoma invades the thyroid, so my question is: is it truly a liposarcoma of the thyroid itself or is it a liposarcoma originating somewhre else and just invading the thyroid? This needs definitely to be clarified and I highly recommend an additional figure which clearly shows the histology that it is truly a thyroid liposarcoma. This should be witnessed by the pathologist who did the examination. He or she should then be a coauthor of the paper.

I am glad to review the paper again, once it is revised.

Authors' Response to Reviewer Comments

Date received: 17-Jul-2022

Response to reviewer 1

Thank you for your comment and your pertinent remark. The pathological evaluation showed that the lesion was invading the thyroid. The origin of the lesion seems to be the peri-thyroidal adipose tissue (this is stated in the report). I think, as you say, that this may not be a "true" liposarcoma of the thyroid itself. Unfortunately, we do not have any images to show. The pathologist who read the slides is already on the author-list (Dr Myriam DECAUSSIN-PETRUCCI).

Response to reviewer 2

Thank you for your comment and your pertinent remarks.

Comments by the Editor-in-Chief to Revised Submission

All reviewer comments were addressed adequately and changes made to the manuscript accordingly and the manuscript should be published in its present stage.