

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Cancer and Tumor International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JCTI_118595
Title of the Manuscript:	Surgical management of oligometastatic port site recurrence following robotic assisted gynaecological cancer surgery – a case report.
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>REVIEW comments required</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important to the scientific community? (Please write a few sentences in this manuscript) R/ THIS MANUSCRIPT IS IMPORTANT FOR THE SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY. IT'S ABOUT A CASE OF CANCER TREATMENT AND ITS POSITIVE RESULT 2. Is the article title appropriate? (If not, please suggest an alternative title) R/ APPROPRIATE TITLE ABOUT THE RESEARCH TOPIC AND THE AUTHORS' OBJECTIVE. 3. Is the article summary comprehensive? R/ THE ABSTRACT MUST BE ADJUSTED TO THE JOURNAL GUIDELINES. IT'S ALMOST DONE. 4. Are the subsections and structure of the manuscript adequate? R/ THE SUBSECTIONS OF THIS TYPE OF MANUSCRIPT ARE ADEQUATE, YOU MUST SIMPLY CORRECT SOME ERRORS LOCATED IN THE REFERENCES AND IN THE PLACEMENT OF THE FIGURES. 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? R/ THIS MANUSCRIPT IS ALMOST CORRECT, IT JUST HAS SOME ERRORS THAT CAN BE CORRECTED AND ACHIEVE A CORRECT MANUSCRIPT FOR PUBLICATION. 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions for additional references, please mention in the review form. R/ THE REFERENCES WERE 14 IN THE FINAL LIST. TWO REFERENCES DO NOT APPEAR IN THE TEXT. 13. Martínez-Palones, J. M., Gil-Moreno, A., Pérez-Benavente, M. A., Garcia-Giménez, A., & Xercavins, J. (2005). Umbilical metastasis after laparoscopic retroperitoneal paraaortic lymphadenectomy for cervical cancer: a true port-site metastasis?. <i>Gynecologic oncology</i>, 97(1), 292–295. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ygyno.2004.11.056 14. Reymond, M. A., Wittekind, C., Jung, A., Hohenberger, W., Kirchner, T., & Köckerling, F. (1997). The incidence of port-site metastases might be reduced. <i>Surgical endoscopy</i>, 11(9), 902–906. https://doi.org/10.1007/s004649900483 IN ADDITION IN THE TEXT DIFFERENT DATES APPEAR FOR A REFERENCE. 12. Benabou K, Khadraoui W, Khader T, Hui P, Fernandez R, Azodi M, Menderes G. Port-Site Metastasis in Gynecological Malignancies. <i>JSLs</i>. 2021 Jan-Mar;25(1):e2020.00081. doi: 10.4293/JSLs.2020.00081. PMID: 33879998; PMCID: PMC8035826. YET A REFERENCE IS MENTIONED WITH TWO DIFFERENT NAMES: 4. Barraez, D., Godoy, H., McElrath, T. et al. Low incidence of port-site metastasis after robotic assisted surgery for endometrial cancer staging: descriptive analysis. <i>J Robotic Surg</i> 9, 91–95 (2015). https://doi.org/10.1007/s11701-014-0491-y 10- (Barres 2015,?????????) PLEASE REVIEW THIS PART AND CORRECT THE ERRORS. <p>(In addition to the 6 points mentioned above, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments) R/ THIS MANUSCRIPT IS IMPORTANT DUE TO THE CASE IT IS TREATED. ERRORS MUST BE CORRECTED FOR POSSIBLE PUBLICATION. FOLLOW THE JOURNAL GUIDELINES.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Minor REVISION comments	Minor REVIEW comments	
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1. Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for academic communications? A/ THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE USED IN THIS MANUSCRIPT IS APPROPRIATE AND ALLOWS COMMUNICATION WITH THE SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY.	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anselmo Enrique Ferrer Hernandez
Department, University & Country	Havana University, Cuba