

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Manuscript NO:** 57483

**Title:** Malignant meningioma with jugular vein invasion and carotid artery extension: A case report and review of the literature

**Reviewer's code:** 02684216

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Iran

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-06-12

**Reviewer chosen by:** Jin-Lei Wang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-09-04 08:11

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-09-04 12:14

**Review time:** 4 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

## **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Comments Manuscript 57483 WJ Clinical Cases Criteria Checklist for New Manuscript

Peer-Review 1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript?

In clinical including pathological aspects: Yes 2 Abstract. Does the abstract summarize

and reflect the work described in the manuscript? Yes 3 Key words. Do the key words

reflect the focus of the manuscript? Yes 4 Background. Does the manuscript

adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? Yes

5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis,

surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? Clinical and pathological aspects:

yes, but Regarding the circulating of meningioma tumor, no supportive document,

mainly, the journey to the host organ has not been, by specific neural antibody, such as

Neurofilament, supported. 6 Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the

experiments used in this study? What are the contributions that the study has made for

research progress in this field? Please read the answer to question 5 7 Discussion. Does

the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key

points concisely, clearly and logically? Are the findings and their applicability/relevance

to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner? Is the discussion accurate and

does it discuss the paper's scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice

sufficiently? Yes but just included the clinical and routine pathological assay ( not

specific at all). 8 Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams and tables sufficient,

good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents? Do figures require

labeling with arrows, asterisks etc., better legends? Yes (only clinical and pathological

aspects). 9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics?

Yes 10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? Yes 11

References. Does the manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections? Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references? Yes for clinical aspects. Regarding migration, "Circulation" is used 12 times with a referral as Reference 9. Mathiesen T., et al. Meningiomas engaging major venous sinuses. World Neurosurg 2014; 81(1):116-124 In fact no background on the Circulating tumor cells are provided. 12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate? Clinically yes 13 Research methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to manuscript type and the appropriate categories, as follows: (1) CARE Checklist (2013) - Case report; (2) CONSORT 2010 Statement - Clinical Trials study, Prospective study, Randomized Controlled trial, Randomized Clinical trial; (3) PRISMA 2009 Checklist - Evidence-Based Medicine, Systematic review, Meta-Analysis; (4) STROBE Statement - Case Control study, Observational study, Retrospective Cohort study; and (5) The ARRIVE Guidelines - Basic study. Did the author prepare the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting? Acceptable. 14 Ethics statements. For all manuscripts involving human studies and/or animal experiments, author(s) must submit the related formal ethics documents that were reviewed and approved by their local ethical review committee. Did the manuscript meet the requirements of ethics? I did not find any ethics statement. Sincerely Parvin Mehdipour Professor, Department of Medical Genetics, School of Medicine, Tehran University of Medical Sciences Email: mehdipor@tums.ac.ir