



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Cancer and Tumor International
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	The authors made a great work but the statistical analysis is missing. They stated is not possible due to the number. I think it could be done. Both subgroups are not clearly analyzed in terms of factors influencing recurrence. It would help to determine what is a risk factor for recurrence. May be a Kaplan Mayer curve could be helpful as well. Time of follow up is not defined. They didn't define when excision is adequate The authors didn't state how the missing information was analyzed Conclusion is not related with the title of the article.	Thank you very much for reviewing our manuscript. We sincerely appreciate your criticisms and suggestions. 1. Statistical analysis is missing: We accept the criticism and have added details regarding statistical analysis in the Abstract and Methodology Section. We used Pearson's chi-square to check if there is an association between subtypes of DFSP and gender, age and site of occurrence. 2. Both subgroups are not clearly analysed regarding factors influencing recurrence: Already known risk factors for recurrence include gender, large tumour size (>2-5cm), tumour site, aggressive variant of DFSP such as FS-DFSP and inadequate resection margin. 3. Maybe a Kaplan-Meier curve could be helpful as well. As indicated in the methodology section the study was cross-sectional and not longitudinal observational analytical study. It was an audit based on histopathology reports. It wouldn't be amenable to creation of Kaplan-Meier curves. 4. Time of follow up is not defined. Noted. Follow up was not part of the study. Our interest was prevalence of aggressive DFSP (gender, age, site, size and FS-DFSP variant). 5. They didn't define when excision is adequate. Noted. We have included a statement on what is regarded adequate excision margin for DFSP in the introduction



SDI Review Form 1.6

		section. 6. The authors didn't state how the missing information was analysed: Noted. However we did indicate that we excluded DFSPs in which pathologists did not specify sub-type. Please see Table 4. 7. Conclusion is not related with the title of the article. Noted. We do not however agree. The following factors are reported to be associated with recurrent and aggressive DFSP: gender, age, tumour site, tumour size and aggressive variant such as FS-DFSP.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		