



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Journal of Cancer and Tumor International</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JCTI_35247
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence of factors influencing recurrence and/or metastasis in dermatofibrosarcoma protuberans
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	1. The authors should include the representative images of gross findings, mitotic count, CD34 stain. 2. What about the survival rate? 3. To determine the prevalence markers of aggressive DFSP, the number of cases is too small. What is the authors opinion?	Thank you very much for reviewing our manuscript. 1. Noted. We would include example of gross findings (pictures, tumour, histology, mitotic count and CD34 stain result) if the reviewer insists. It may significantly increase the size of the manuscript) and make it more of a review article which we will gladly do. 2. Noted. The study was focused on pathology and was a cross-sectional audit based on histopathology records. It was not amenable to calculation of survival rate. 3. Noted. We agree. The number is quite small. DFSP is a relatively rare tumour although its rate appears to be increasing. We have therefore modified both the title and aim of the study by replacing prevalence with frequency of occurrence which is not statistically restrictive.
Minor REVISION comments	1. In table 3, there are no size data for case 2, 9, 11. What happened in these cases? 2. In the results, there are no indicators 'Table 3' and 'Table 4'. What paragraphs are describing about table 3 and 4? 3. The number of total records of DFSP is 75. However, in the table 4, the number of classical type is 41 and that of FS-DFSP is 12. Where are the other 22 cases?	1. Diagnosis in Cases 2, 9 and 11 was made following Core Biopsy. Size was not specified on histology report as at that time the DFSP was not excised. 2. Noted. The manuscript has been revised and reference to Table 3 and 4 have been inserted. 3. Noted. Explanation regarding the 22 DFSPs for which pathologists did not specify if they were classical or FS-DFSP is contained under Table 4.
Optional/General comments		