

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 63818

Title: Central pontine myelinolysis mimicking glioma in diabetes: A case report

Reviewer's code: 05643326

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Brazil

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-02-05

Reviewer chosen by: Ya-Juan Ma

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-02-11 00:17

Reviewer performed review: 2021-02-16 23:01

Review time: 5 Days and 22 Hours

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 Grade E: Do not publish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 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
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
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The article is relevant, relatively rare along the lines that happened in the case of the study. Therefore, it calls attention to something that can happen related to diabetes, even if it is not common. It is relevant and well-written article. It has good designed outline and method. I recommend ACCEPTING and PUBLISHING the paper.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 63818

Title: Central pontine myelinolysis mimicking glioma in diabetes: A case report

Reviewer's code: 03847081

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Serbia

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-02-05

Reviewer chosen by: Ya-Juan Ma

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-02-11 01:33

Reviewer performed review: 2021-02-25 15:59

Review time: 14 Days and 14 Hours

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 type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" 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

Criteria Checklist for New Manuscript Peer-Review

- 1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? 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? YES
- 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? YES
- 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? The manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically. Also, the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner, the discussion is accurate and discuss the paper's scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently.
- 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? The figures are good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents.
- 9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? N/A
- 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 authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections? Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite

references? The manuscript cites appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections without self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references. 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? The manuscript should be re-organized according to the "Guidelines for manuscript preparation, submission, and manuscript format: Case report" proposed by "World Journal of Clinical Cases" and language and grammar should be improved based on specified suggestions. 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? The manuscript should be re-organized according to the "Guidelines for manuscript preparation, submission, and manuscript format: Case report" proposed by "World Journal of Clinical Cases" 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? YES. This paper describes interesting case of central pontine myelinolysis mimicking glioma in patient with diabetes. Since such a case can lead to diagnostic confusion, manuscript deserves to be published. However, this reviewer has the following suggestions: General comment: 1. Please, organize the manuscript according to the "Guidelines for manuscript preparation,

submission, and manuscript format: Case report” proposed by “World Journal of Clinical Cases” Specific comments: Abstract 1. “usually occurred” should be changed to “usually occurs” 2. “The blood The electrolyte, blood routine, hepatorenal functions were in a normal range generally.” – please, rewrite this sentence. 3. Page 2, line 11 and 12 – “even worsen” should be changed to “even worsened” 4. Page 2, line 12 – “Regarding to the clinical history...” should be changed to “Regarding the clinical history...” or “With regard to the clinical history...” 5. Page 2, line 14 “...therapy of corticosteroids was arranged...” should be changed “...therapy of corticosteroids was administered...” 6. Page 2, line 16 – “obviously” – please, consider replacing this adverb with another one. In this context, it is more appropriate to use “significantly” 7. “Diabetes could rarely accompany with CPM, and corticosteroids might benefit for prognosis” – please, rewrite this sentence. It is not grammatically clear. (e.g. “Diabetes could be rarely accompanied with CPM, and patients who experienced this neurological complication could benefit from corticosteroids treatment.”) 8. Page 3, line 6 – “Yet CPM was considered...” should be changed to “Currently, CPM is considered as...” – please, avoid jargon phrases in scientific papers (e.g. “Yet”) Introduction 1. Page 3, line 8 – “basalt nuclei” should be changed to “basal nuclei” 2. “In time of the extremely rapid correction of hyponatremia, the extracellular toxicity increased quickly without promptly adjustment of intracellular osmoles” – please, rewrite this sentence more clearly 3. “The lesions frequently demonstrated hypointense on T1-weighted image (T1WI), hyperintense on T2-weighted image (T2WI) / fluid-attenuated inversion recovery (FLAIR), hyperintense on diffusion weighted imaging (DWI), isointensity or hypointense on apparent diffusion coefficient (ADC), usually without enhancement in magnetic resonance imaging (MRI).” Please, rewrite this sentence as follows: “The lesions are frequently demonstrated as hypointense on T1-weighted image (T1WI), hyperintense on T2-weighted image (T2WI) / fluid-attenuated inversion recovery

(FLAIR), hyperintense on diffusion weighted imaging (DWI), and isointense or hypointense on apparent diffusion coefficient (ADC), without gadolinium enhancement.”

4. Page 3, line 19 - “classic trident shape” should be change to “classic trident-shaped area” 5. Page 3, line 19 - “Prevention” should be changed to “Preventive” or even better “Prophylactic” 6. Page 3, line 20 and 21 - “without evidence of administration in corticosteroids” should be changed to “without evidence of efficacy of adjunctive corticosteroid therapy” 7. “Therapy of methylprednisolone pulse in the acute phase and dose tapering subsequently improved his outcomes” please, rewrite this sentence as follows: “Methylprednisolone pulse therapy in the acute phase followed by dose tapering improved patient’s clinical outcome.” Case presentation 1. Page 4, line 5 - “for” should be changed to “due to” 2. “Two weeks prior, he was first admitted to the local hospital by the time gangrene developed in the big toe of his right foot, with the apparent thirst and urorrhagia.” please, rewrite this sentence as follows: “Two weeks earlier, he was admitted to the local hospital because of big toe gangrene of his right foot associated with the apparent thirst and urorrhagia.” 3. “electrolyte, blood routine, hepatorenal functions” should be changed to “electrolytes, hematological parameters and biochemical markers of hepatic and renal function”. 4. “Considering further relative examination” should be changed to “Considering further possible examinations” 5. Page 4, line 13 “The administrations included...” should be changed to “The treatment included...” 6. Page 4, line 14 “(0.1U/kg)” – please, add space between value and unit 7. “Yet the neurological symptom was worse with blurred vision and slight dysarthria, corresponding to the lesions in the brainstem on MRI subsequently” should be changed as follows: “However, after completion of treatment, neurological disorders in form of blurred vision and slight dysarthria, corresponding to the lesions in the brainstem demonstrated subsequently on MRI, occurred” 8. Page 4, line 22 - “performed indwelling catheterization” should be changed to “indwelling catheterization was

performed" 9. Page 5, line 4 "tendinous reflect in all limb's extremities" should be changed to "tendon reflexes in all limbs" or "in all extremities" 10. "Yet no pathological reflection drew out." should be changed to "However, there were no pathological reflexes" 11. "10 /m3, C-reactive protein of 44 mm/h" – please, rewrite this parameters with adequate units and values 12. "proteus mirabilis" should be changed to "Proteus mirabilis" (italic font) 13. Page 5, line 19 "evaluating" should be change to "elevated levels of" 14. "(5.9mmol/L)" – please, add space between value and unit 15. (150 mmH2O) –please rewrite "2" in subscript 16. "The lesions on admission distributed diffusely" please, add "were" before "distributed" 17. "According to his clinical manifestations and auxiliary examination results, the patient was considered as central pontine myelinolysis secondary to hyperosmolar hyperglycemia" – this sentence should be change as follows: "According to his clinical manifestations and auxiliary examination results, central pontine myelinolysis secondary to hyperosmolar hyperglycemia was established as definitive diagnosis." 18. Page 7, line 5 "arranged" should be changed to "administrated" Discussion 19. Page 9, line 2, "Yet" should be changed to "Currently" 20. Please, add in this section table with summarized similar cases published in the literature (some of them were already cited in the literature of manuscript) with demographic, laboratory, clinical and imaging data and describe briefly the most important results. Although there are not enough patients to draw conclusions based on statistical significance, try to point out some facts that could be of clinical significance. 21. "hyperglycemic should be careful during treatment" should be changed to "correction of hyperglycaemia should be performed with caution" 22. "Though without autopsy results, the positive therapeutic response as well as the features of imaging features dragged out our diagnostic direction of glioma", please, rewrite this sentence, it is not clear. I guess you meant a biopsy, not an autopsy. 23. "distinguish metabolic diseases with tumor" should be changed to "distinguish



**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>

metabolic diseases from tumor” 24. “Yet it remained unknown about the efficiency of hypoglycemic treatment alone or combined with corticosteroids.” should be changed to “However, the efficacy of hypoglycaemic treatment alone or in combination with corticosteroids remains unknown.” 25. Page 9, line 20 “in” should be changed to “with”

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 63818

Title: Central pontine myelinolysis mimicking glioma in diabetes: A case report

Reviewer's code: 05643326

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Brazil

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-02-05

Reviewer chosen by: Chen-Chen Gao

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-03-10 19:13

Reviewer performed review: 2021-03-10 19:20

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 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
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 type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The author made the corrections. I recommend to accept the manuscript.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 63818

Title: Central pontine myelinolysis mimicking glioma in diabetes: A case report

Reviewer's code: 03847081

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Serbia

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-02-05

Reviewer chosen by: Chen-Chen Gao

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-03-11 12:07

Reviewer performed review: 2021-03-11 13:24

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 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
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
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

The manuscript entitled "Central pontine myelinolysis mimicking glioma in diabetes: a

case report" has been revised according to the reviewers' suggestions. Therefore, it deserves to be published after a few minor corrections: 1. Page 10, line 9 - "For instance, a 20-year-old type 1 diabetes female was reported acute onset spastic quadriparesis with dysarthria and mild ataxia [6]." - please rewrite this sentence as follows "For instance, a 20-year-old type 1 diabetes female was reported with acute onset of spastic quadriparesis with dysarthria and mild ataxia [6]." 2. Page 10, line 10 - "A 45-year-old woman..." - please, start the sentence as follows: "Also, a 45-year-old woman presented to..." 3. Page 10, line 12 - "And a 45-year-old male with past medical history of type 2 diabetes, hypertension..." please, start the sentence as follows: "Likewise, a 45-year-old male with past medical history of type 2 diabetes, hypertension..."