

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 77783

Title: Supratentorial hemangioblastoma at the anterior skull base: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 00058573

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: FASCRS, MBBS, MD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Chief Doctor, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-05-20

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-05-20 17:16

Reviewer performed review: 2022-05-20 17:48

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[] Grade A: Priority publishing [] Grade B: Minor language polishing [Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	 [] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[]Yes [Y]No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous





statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors have presented a rare case of HB. The manuscript is well written though many language mistakes need correction.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 77783

Title: Supratentorial hemangioblastoma at the anterior skull base: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06257045

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Academic Research

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Indonesia

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-05-20

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-05-26 05:50

Reviewer performed review: 2022-06-02 00:54

Review time: 6 Days and 19 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[] Grade A: Priority publishing [] Grade B: Minor language polishing [Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	 [] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous



Baishideng **Publishing**

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

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The report did a good job in presenting a case of hemangioblastoma at the anterior skull base of a 51 year old male. The case is mildly interesting as the hemangioblastoma occured in a rare region (i.e., base of the anterior skull). This report also try to be a foundation for early imaging to diagnose hemangioblastoma. However, there are some weaknesses in this report, including: (1) Please review your English language and revise the paper accordingly. Some diction need to be improved for more clarity and flow (2) Several sentences are missing references. For example, the first and second sentences from the introduction section (3) For the "revealed oculus dexter (OD) =1.0, oculus sinister (OS) =0.6 ", what are these number indicates? is this a diameter measurement or vision or what? (4) Do not put subjective measure like "a slight defect" or "should be" into a scientific paper. Please revise accordingly (5) Please revise the case presentation section and add more details. The case history is very lacking. For example, it is hard to believe that the patient had not done anything for his eyesight in the two years (6) For the lab exam, I believe that some important factors should still be explained even if the result is normal; for instance the CBC (as tumors can cause bleeding and neovascularization which lower hemoglobin), etc. This also give more insight as to what biomarker can be relevant and what cannot (7) Please provide the full term of acronyms on its first use (8) Please be consistent on naming (i.e., "Figure 1" vs. "Fig.2") (9) What do you mean by "few +" or "1% +"? Does "few +" means that some are + and some are - or what? (10) Define "large seizure" and please elaborate more on the follow up (11) Are there any imaging done on the follow up? Isn't there any possibility of reccuring Hemangioblastoma that will provoke seizure? (12) Please limit the references to the past 5 years to ensure recency. More in depth review of the paper can only be done after the



after-mentioned revision are done by the authors.



RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 77783

Title: Supratentorial hemangioblastoma at the anterior skull base: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06257045

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Academic Research

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Indonesia

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-05-20

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ping Yan

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-06-29 08:43

Reviewer performed review: 2022-06-29 09:17

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	 [] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	 [] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No



SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you to the authors for their improvement in the manuscript per the reviewers' comment. The manuscript had been modified well, yet minor changes are still needed. 1) Please seperate the final diagnosis section into histopathological findings and final diagnosis as there is a pathological tissue explanation in the current final diagnosis section 2) No need of "to summarize" term in the conclusion 3) Refrain from using etc. maybe use "and other chronic diseases." for example 4) It is preffered to put the term "ophthalmologist" instead of "specialist" as "specialist" can refer to many departments 5) Please put the full term for "T2WI" and "FLAIR" at the first time of use 6) Negative cranial nerve examinations can be interpreted as bad response in every exam or no problem at all. To avoid confusion please just put the term "normal" instead of "negative" 7) continuing from (6), after saying that cranial nerve exam is negative, the author contradict themselves by stating problems of the ocular acuity (cranial nerve II). The reviewer advise the author to just put the term "except" between those two sentences to make it flow better 8) Please give the reference for the discussion of "HB is often diagnosed between 35 and"



RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases Manuscript NO: 77783 Title: Supratentorial hemangioblastoma at the anterior skull base: A case report Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed Peer-review model: Single blind Reviewer's code: 00058573 Position: Editorial Board Academic degree: FASCRS, MBBS, MD Professional title: Associate Professor, Chief Doctor, Surgeon Reviewer's Country/Territory: India Author's Country/Territory: China Manuscript submission date: 2022-05-20 Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ping Yan Reviewer accepted review: 2022-06-29 10:12

Reviewer performed review: 2022-06-29 10:18

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	 [] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	 [] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No



SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I am satisfied with the revision