

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Otorhinolaryngology

**Manuscript NO:** 34756

**Title:** Day Case Paediatric Microlaryngobronchoscopy: A Prospective Study

**Reviewer's code:** 00503773

**Reviewer's country:** Turkey

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2017-05-24

**Date reviewed:** 2017-05-26

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [ Y ] Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> [ Y ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [ Y ] No	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [ Y ] No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I read the manuscript named " Day Case Paediatric Microlaryngobronchoscopy: A Prospective Study " (Manuscript NO: 34756 ) and my recommendations are as follows; Abstract: Adequate, summarizing the topic. Discussion: Topics has been discussed with all aspects. References: References are appropriate and updated. Tables are reflects the major findings of the study, and they are appropriately presented. Paediatric Microlaryngobronchoscopy is feasible, safe and acceptable as day case surgery in carefully selected patients. It is crucial that the authors point out to this issues. There is a typological error on the 7th line of abstract section (it is written suveys, it should be surveys). This manuscript was well-written and documented. This study is clearly presented . I think that this manuscript is suitable and worth to be published in World Journal of Otorhinolaryngology.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Otorhinolaryngology

**Manuscript NO:** 34756

**Title:** Day Case Paediatric Microlaryngobronchoscopy: A Prospective Study

**Reviewer's code:** 00503695

**Reviewer's country:** Germany

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2017-05-24

**Date reviewed:** 2017-06-06

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript describes the feasibility of diagnostic microlaryngoscopy as day case surgery in 79 paediatric patients by complications and a patient questionnaire, in which 57 of the patients took part over a 26 months study period. The authors conclude that diagnostic microlaryngoscopy is feasible, safe and acceptable as day case surgery in carefully selected paediatric patients. Following points need revision before publication: 1. Include microlaryngobronchoscopy, microlaryngoscopy, laryngoscopy and bronchoscopy into the key words. 2. List the indications for performed microlaryngobronchoscopy in the Material and Methods section completely. 3. Several patients had multiple microlaryngobronchoscopies before. Were they all uneventful? 4. Check the references according to the Journal Style Guidelines, e.g. small or capital letters for the article title in the reference list. Change to 'Clin Otolaryngol' in reference 3 and to '82(3), 116-119' in reference 6. Minor Points: a) Abstract, Results, Line 3: Please change to '57'. b) Core tip, Line 4: Please include a full stop before 'Out of'. c) Material and Methods, Line 10: Please change to 'whilst'. d) Material and Methods, Line 16: Please



## BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

---

change to 'collected'. e) Results, Parental Satisfaction. Line 6: Please change to 'undergoing'. f) Table 1: Please change to 'anesthetist's preference. g) Table 3: medical advice sought. None, Number: Please Change to '42'. Sincerely,