



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 63663

Title: Prognostic values of intraorbital segment of optic nerve sheath diameter (ONSD) and ONSD/eyeball transverse diameter ratio for comatose patients with acute stroke : An observational study

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05207387

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: DSc, PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: South Korea

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-07-24

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-08-07 08:45

Reviewer performed review: 2022-08-07 09:33

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 Grade E: Do not publish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



**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

Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thanks for recommending me as a reviewer. In this paper, authors aimed to evaluate the roles of the optic nerve sheath diameter (ONSD) and ONSD/eyeball transverse diameter (ETD) ratio in predicting the prognosis of comatose patients with acute stroke during hospitalization. Sixty-seven comatose patients with acute stroke were retrospectively recruited. ONSD and ETD were measured by head CT scans. ONSD and ETD were measured by head CT scans within 24 h of coma onset. It was found that the mortality increased when $ONSD > 5.7$ mm or $ONSD/ETD$ ratio > 0.25 . In this paper, the ONSD/ETD ratio was more stable than ONSD alone, which be preferred in clinical practice. Overall, this paper is well written. If authors complete minor revisions, the quality of the study will be further improved.

1. The introduction section is well written. But it's too short. If the authors describe in more detail the trends of previous studies related to the predicting value of optic nerve sheath diameter in the introduction section, it can help readers to understand.
2. In Table 1, "x²/t/z value" seems unnecessary.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 63663

Title: Prognostic values of intraorbital segment of optic nerve sheath diameter (ONSD) and ONSD/eyeball transverse diameter ratio for comatose patients with acute stroke : An observational study

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer’s code: 05236189

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Academic Research, Adjunct Associate Professor, Research Associate

Reviewer’s Country/Territory: Brazil

Author’s Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-07-24

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-08-09 02:24

Reviewer performed review: 2022-08-09 02:49

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" 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 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 type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. Title should include the type of the study and the location where the study was done.
2. The aim should be more precise. E.g., the prognosis of awareness, the prognosis of death, and the prognosis of neurological outcomes.
3. It is advised to remember that the best scientific term is cranial CT scan instead of head CT scan.
4. Methods Was coherence optical tomography done? Could the inclusion of different types of stroke affect the results? The authors should include stroke causes in the baseline table. IRB number should be provided in the methodology section.
5. Statistics How do the authors control the confounding variables? How was calculated the power of the study? Why has MedCalc been used instead of SPSS or R software? How was data distribution? If the Pearson correlation coefficient was used, the authors should provide the graphs stipulated by the statistical program.
6. Results Baseline characteristics should be provided in a table. It is advised to remove the description from the manuscript. There were significant differences in the variables in Table 1. Could these variables, instead of the ONSD/ETD ratio, explain the outcomes in the study?
7. Discussion The authors should include a table with a comparison of the previous study.
8. The reviewer would like to request the rationality of the ONSD/ETD ratio. Is this a preliminary study using this ratio?



RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 63663

Title: Prognostic values of intraorbital segment of optic nerve sheath diameter (ONSD) and ONSD/eyeball transverse diameter ratio for comatose patients with acute stroke : An observational study

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05236189

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Academic Research, Adjunct Associate Professor, Research Associate

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Brazil

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-07-24

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-09-13 19:45

Reviewer performed review: 2022-09-13 20:18

Review time: 1 Hour

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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection



**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

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

I want to congratulate the authors for their significant improvement in the quality of the manuscript. 1. Could the Audio-Core tip be uploaded in better quality? There is unusual background noise. Try to record directly from the computer. 2. "Core Tip" section was written two times.