

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR- 51952

Date: 27/05/2025

Title: *A Rare Case of Biphenotypic Sinonasal Carcinoma Operated in Our Institution*

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: 27/05/2025

Reviewer's Comment for Publication:

This paper effectively documents a rare instance of BSNS, highlighting the importance of combined diagnostic modalities for accurate identification. It underscores the tumor's distinctive features, including immunohistochemical and genetic markers, and suggests that complete surgical excision remains the mainstay of treatment. Further long-term follow-up and larger case series are necessary to better understand its clinical course and optimal management strategies.

Reviewer's Comment / Report

Strengths:

- **Novelty and Relevance:** The paper reports a rare case of biphenotypic sinonasal sarcoma (BSNS), contributing valuable clinical and diagnostic insights into this uncommon entity.
- **Comprehensive Diagnostic Approach:** It emphasizes a multi-modal diagnostic strategy, including imaging (CT, MRI), histopathology, immunohistochemistry, and molecular analysis (such as PAX3-MAML3 fusion), which is critical for accurate diagnosis.
- **Detailed Case Presentation:** The case description is thorough, documenting clinical features, imaging findings, surgical management, and follow-up, which can be informative for clinicians encountering similar cases.
- **Literature Contextualization:** The discussion contextualizes the case within current knowledge, referencing recent WHO classifications and pertinent literature, aiding understanding of BSNS's distinct features.

Weaknesses:

- **Limited Data on Outcomes:** The follow-up duration and long-term outcomes are briefly mentioned; extended follow-up data would better illustrate behavior, recurrence, and prognosis.
- **Absence of Comparative Analysis:** The paper lacks a detailed comparison with other sinonasal malignancies or sarcomas, which could strengthen the differential diagnosis discussion.
- **Small Sample Size:** As a case report, the findings are inherently limited in scope; larger case series or multicenter studies are needed for generalization.
- **Lack of In-depth Molecular Data:** Though molecular analysis is mentioned, detailed genetic findings are minimal, which could have added depth to understanding tumor biology.