



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	In this paper authors described the prevalence of markers of aggressive DFSP which include older age, tumor in the head and neck region, large size at presentation, recurrent tumor and histological subtypes other than the classical variant (FS-DFSP). The analysis concerned Africans with an average age of 39.7 years. On the basis of analysis the following factors were distinguished: tumor size (larger than 5cm) and age above 40 years. In part "recommendation" authors emphasized that dermatofibroarcoma protuberans should be managed by a dedicated multidisciplinary team especially for patients older than 40 years, with tumor larger than 5cm in diameter and in recurrent disease. It is important statement which should impact the clinical practice. Overall, this is understandable idea. However, it requires some correction. The detailed comments are as follows: 1. Results: line 45. Table 1 is mentioned twice (in line 44 and 45). It should be placed only in line 44 after the sentence "<i>All were black Africans with an average age of 39.7 year</i>". Results concerning size of all DFSPs according to site are presented in Table 2. In	Thank you very much for reviewing our manuscript. We sincerely appreciate the review and valuable inputs. 1. Noted. We agree. The manuscript has been revised Table 1 will now appear immediately after the statement "majority 57.3% (43/75) were females (Table 1). The second Table 1 we agree should actually be Table 2. 2. Noted. We agree. We have revised the manuscript and started with discussion of the whole group and then comparison classical DFSP and FS-DFSP. 3. Noted. We agree. We have revised the manuscript and attempted to cut down some information. 4. Noted. Reference to Table 3 has been inserted. Please Table 3 now becomes Table 4 and vice versa. 5. Reference to Table 4 has been inserted.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	line 45 table 1 should be changed to table 2. 2. Results: The text should be divided to two separate paragraphs, first which describe overall group and the second which compare DFSP with FS-DFSP. This will make the text more legible and clear. 3. Discussion: The text contains a lot of information about the differences between DFSP and FS-DFSP. They could be more discussed in the part "discussion". 4. Table: Table 3 - Demography and histological findings in FS-DFSPs (n = 12) is not mentioned in the text of manuscript. Table: Table 4 - Comparison between Classical DFSP and FS-DFSP is also not mentioned in the text of manuscript.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		