

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 62967

Title: Novel compound heterozygous GPR56 gene mutation in a twin with lissencephaly: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05319907

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MBBS

Professional title: Research Scientist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-01-31

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-06-21 13:18

Reviewer performed review: 2021-07-01 00:20

Review time: 9 Days and 11 Hours

Scientific quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input 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 Grade E: Do not publish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
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

**Peer-reviewer
statements**

Peer-Review: [☒] Anonymous [☐] Onymous

Conflicts-of-Interest: [☐] Yes [☒] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to review this manuscript. I would like to commend on a job well-done by the authors. There is merit in the manuscript, being a novel mutation and I suggest the authors to make few minor revisions as mentioned below

- 1 Title Please change the title to- A novel compound heterozygous GPR56 gene mutation in a twin with lissencephaly- Case report with review of literature
- 2 Abstract The abstract summarizes and reflects the work described in the manuscript. Use full-forms like 5-months old, 1 day for timeline
- 3 Key words The key words reflect the focus of the manuscript
- 4 Introduction The authors have adequately described the introduction, including the aim of the paper and the importance of their case.
- 5 Case presentation. I would like the authors to give a bit more detail on the history of presenting illness like was the seizures progressive, how many episodes did the patient experience, how long did each episode last, any associated symptoms, aggravating or relieving factors, or any triggers etc. All other parts of the case report are adequately presented.
- 6 Literature review. The authors have made a good effort in compiling all reported cases of GPR56 mutations and have adequately summarized it in table 1.
- 7 Discussion. The discussion is concise and to the point. All key points are highlighted clearly and in a logical manner. The paper will be great addition to existing literature.
- 8 Illustrations and tables. The figures and tables are adequate, good quality and appropriately illustrates the contents of the article.
- 9 Biostatistics. Not Applicable
- 10 Units. Not Applicable
- 11 References. The manuscript has cited 22 references, and all are important and appropriate to the current article. There are no self-cited, omitted, incorrectly cited and/or over-cited references.
- 12 Quality of manuscript organization

and presentation. The manuscript is well-organized and presented in a concise manner. It requires very minor language polishing for grammar and sentence organization before accepting for publication. 13 Research methods and reporting. Authors have prepared their manuscript according as per the CARE Checklist for case reports [The authors have read the CARE Checklist (2016), and the manuscript was prepared and revised according to the CARE Checklist (2016)]. 14 Ethics statements. Authors have submitted the related formal ethics documents that were reviewed and approved by their local ethical review committee (This study was approved by the ethics committee of Children's Hospital of Nanjing Medical University).