

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 61037

Title: Rehabilitation and pharmacotherapy in a patient of NMOSD: a case report

Reviewer's code: 00741626

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: DSc

Professional title: Doctor, Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Mexico

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-12-04

Reviewer chosen by: Li Ma

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-12-18 20:21

Reviewer performed review: 2020-12-18 21:13

Review time: 1 Hour

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 Grade E: Do not publish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

The manuscript is well written and presents an interesting case; however, in its current form, need amendments to address in its different sections. Introduction. Please mention what the challenges in the diagnosis and treatment of this clinical entity are. Case Report. Use a line graph to represent the improvement on some laboratory test and clinical scores, combine visual graphs with numerical data to facilitate understanding of evolution to the readers. Discussion The performance of MRI is mandatory for the diagnosis of long segmental myelitis and the followup. Explain to the readers why the patients did not undergo a 2nd and 3rd MRI. It has been evinced in the literature the usefulness of followup to document an improvement of spinal cord injury in animal models (include reference) at 1, 4 and 8 weeks. **Delayed injection of polypyrrole doped with iodine particle suspension after spinal cord injury in rats improves functional recovery and decreased tissue damage evaluated by 3.0 Tesla in vivo magnetic resonance imaging. Spine J. 2017 Apr;17(4):562-73. MRI also allows a quantitative assessment of spine recovery (include reference below), why your department did not use this useful application if the patient got MRI at baseline? Feasibility of in vivo quantitative magnetic resonance imaging with diffusion-weighted imaging, T2-weighted relaxometry, and diffusion tensor imaging in a clinical 3-tesla magnetic resonance scanner for the acute traumatic spinal cord injury of rats: technical note. Spine. 2013 Sep 15;38(20):E1242-9. What is the policy in the hospital and country about the use of MRI assessment compared with the international literature? Why did the patient not underwent brain MRI to evaluate optic nerves enhancement? Mention it he 1st paragraph of this section, what is the clinical relevance of this report compared with previous cases in the literature.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 61037

Title: Rehabilitation and pharmacotherapy in a patient of NMOSD: a case report

Reviewer's code: 00741626

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: DSc

Professional title: Doctor, Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Mexico

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-12-04

Reviewer chosen by: Man Liu (Part-Time Editor)

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-01-18 21:01

Reviewer performed review: 2021-01-18 21:27

Review time: 1 Hour

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Authors have sufficiently satisfactorily addressed the remarks raised by the reviewer.