ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Otorhinolaryngology
ESPS manuscript NO: 24659
Title: WORD PERCEPTION IN NOISE AT DIFFERENT CHANNELS IN SIMULATED COCHLEAR IMPLANT LISTENERS
Reviewer's code: 00503773
Reviewer's country: Turkey
Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong
Date sent for review: 2016-02-01 15:20
Date reviewed: 2016-02-19 15:07

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[Y] Accept
[Y] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] The same title	[ ] High priority for publication
[ ] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Duplicate publication	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	[ ] Plagiarism	[ ] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E: Poor		[ ] No	[ ] Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[ ] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I read the manuscript named " Word percept?on ?n no?se at d?fferent channels ?n s?mulated cochlear ?mplant l?steners " that have been submitted to World Journal of Otorhinolaryngology (ESPS Manuscript NO: 24659).   and my recommendations are as follows; Title: It is accurately reflects the major topic and contents of the study. Abstract: Adequate, summarizing the topic. Methods: Convenient with the purpose of the study. Discussion: Topics has been discussed with all aspects. References are appropriate, relevant, and updated. Tables and figures are reflects the major findings of the study, and they are appropriately presented. This study is clearly presented . Also, this manuscript gives additional new knowledge to the literatüre. This manuscript is well written and documented. I think that this manuscript is suitable and worth to be published in World Journal of Otorhinolaryngology.

REPLY BY AUTHORS: Respected Sir/Madam,
      Thank   you   for   appreciation   and   motivational   remark   toward   my   work.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Poor	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejected	Google Search: [ ] The same title [ ] Duplicate publication [ ] Plagiarism [ ] No BPG Search: [ ] The same title [ ] Duplicate publication [ ] Plagiarism [ ] No	[Y] Accept [ ] High priority for publication [ ] Rejection [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

MY COMMENTS: Well written paper with good language and grammar. Some polishing in the overall morph is needed... and some clarifications:

1- Please state the minimum channels that are to be present in order to achieve good performance in the previous studies than yours and if they similar to yours.

REPLY: In the discussion portion, 1st Paragraph 11th line , we have mentioned conclusion from our study i.e. "However, minimum 8 channels are required to achieve at least more than 50% performance irrespective of adverse listening condition (-5dBSNR)." We have included few studies which are in support our study i.e. Lawson et al., Eddington et al., Perreau A. However, we find few studies who does not support our studies i.e. Fishman et al., and Verschuur in 2009.

2-Please make a more extent conclusion and not similar with the one in the abstract.

REPLY: We have made conclusion bit more descriptive and we added few more concluding points as asked by reviewers.

CONCLUSION The outcome of the present study highlights the significance of more number of channels and higher SNR for better word perception in noise in simulated cochlear implantees. Present study also quantified the deteriorating effect on word perception with decrease in SNR at different channels. Current study also showed that minimum 8 channels are required to achieve at least more than 50% performance irrespective of adverse listening condition (-5dBSNR).