

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Cancer and Tumor International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JCTI_126502
Title of the Manuscript:	Adamantinoma-like Ewing Sarcoma: A Report of two rare cases in the pancreatic tail and spine
Type of the Article	Case reports

#### **General guidelines for the Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

### Review Form 3

#### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	This manuscript provides valuable insights into Adamantinoma-like Ewing sarcoma (ALES), a rare and aggressive variant of Ewing sarcoma, documented in unusual locations like the pancreatic tail and spine. Given the limited literature on ALES in these sites, the article contributes essential knowledge to the scientific and clinical communities by highlighting diagnostic challenges and sharing details on molecular and immunohistochemical profiling.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The title is suitable as it clearly and concisely conveys the unique focus of the manuscript. Or "Adamantinoma-like Ewing Sarcoma in Rare Locations: Case Reports of Pancreatic and Spinal Tumors with Diagnostic Insights"	
<b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b>	The abstract is comprehensive but could be slightly refined for clarity. Consider briefly mentioning the specific diagnostic markers or techniques (e.g., FISH or immunohistochemistry) in a clearer sequence. Additionally, a short concluding sentence about the potential impact on treatment strategies would enhance the abstract's appeal.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	The manuscript's structure is appropriate and logically organized. The case descriptions, introduction, and conclusion are well-separated and provide clear, focused sections that guide the reader through the manuscript effectively.	
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	This manuscript is scientifically robust, presenting accurate data on histopathological and molecular findings that support the diagnosis of ALES. The use of a thorough immunohistochemical panel and FISH analysis validates the diagnosis, adding scientific rigor.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	The comparison to existing literature on ALES, particularly in rare sites, enhances the credibility and relevance of the cases reported. The study's depth in methodology and contextualization within broader research underscores its technical soundness.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The manuscript reads clearly, though some complex technical terms in the abstract and discussion sections could be simplified to increase accessibility for a broader audience.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	A brief discussion of the prognosis and potential treatment options for ALES, as noted in the literature, could be added to enhance clinical relevance.	

#### PART 2:

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

#### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hoai TP Dinh
Department, University & Country	Hue University of Medicine and Pharmacy, Vietnam