



REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR- 50899

Date: 03/04/2025

Title: Adenoid Cystic Carcinoma of the Trachea: A Report of Two Cases and Literature Review

Recommendation:

- Accept as it is
 Accept after minor revision.....
 Accept after major revision
 Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality		✓		
Clarity		✓		
Significance		✓		

Reviewer Name: Dr. S. K. Nath

Date: 03/04/2025

Reviewer's Comment for Publication:

The paper successfully highlights the clinical presentation, diagnosis, and management of Adenoid Cystic Carcinoma of the Trachea through two case studies. It reinforces the importance of early diagnosis, surgical intervention, and the role of radiotherapy in treatment. However, the findings would be more impactful with a larger sample size, comparative studies, and long-term follow-up data.

Reviewer's Comment / Report

Strengths of the Paper

- **Relevance & Rarity:** The paper highlights a rare form of malignancy, Adenoid Cystic Carcinoma (ACC) of the Trachea, which constitutes only 0.1–0.26 cases per 100,000 individuals. This makes it a valuable contribution to medical literature.
- **Case-Based Approach:** The inclusion of two real-life cases (a 71-year-old female and a 55-year-old male) provides practical insights into clinical presentation, diagnosis, and treatment options.
- **Clinical Significance:** It discusses various diagnostic and treatment modalities, such as:
 - **Therapeutic bronchoscopy** (to improve symptoms before surgery).
 - **Surgical resection** (as the primary treatment).
 - **Radiotherapy** (as an effective alternative).
- **Detailed Diagnostic Approach:** The study effectively presents how bronchoscopy, biopsy, and imaging (CT scans) are used to diagnose ACC.
- **Clear Writing & Structure:** The paper is well-organized, with sections including summary, introduction, case reports, and discussion.

Weaknesses of the Paper

- **Limited Sample Size:** The study presents only two cases, which is insufficient for drawing general conclusions about ACC of the trachea. A larger study population would improve its impact.
- **Lack of Comparative Analysis:** The paper does not compare its findings with other studies or databases, making it harder to assess whether these cases are representative of the disease's broader characteristics.
- **No Long-Term Follow-Up Data:** While the study reports short-term outcomes, it does not provide long-term survival rates, recurrence risks, or quality-of-life impacts after treatment.
- **Absence of Statistical Analysis:** No statistical validation (e.g., survival rates, recurrence probability) is provided, which would strengthen its scientific reliability.