

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 69587

**Title:** Spinocerebellar ataxia autosomal recessive four with a VP 3D mutation: a case report and review of literature

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05914788

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Reviewer\_Country

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-07-10

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-07-11 00:31

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-07-12 06:22

**Review time:** 1 Day and 5 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 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

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: [ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] Anonymous [ <input type="radio"/> ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ <input type="radio"/> ] Yes [ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] No
-------------------------------------	---

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Title and abstract: - Based on my opinion the title and abstract were clear and strongly cover the study. Objectives, aims, methods and results are elucidated well and are convincing. Introduction: - The introduction explains completely and covers the purpose and objectives of the study. Methods: - The methods were mostly explained well by authors, but there were some unexplained and incomprehensible parts. Preparing animals for research is one way scientists can minimize animal stress. Preparation most commonly includes quarantine, acclimation, and stabilization. Make clearer. -What exact include/exclusion criteria for this experimental study? Results: -This data and analysis are plausible. Discussion: -Discussion part was done very well and all the results were described in this part clearly and completely. All the analysis, results and finding are relevant and refrained from providing nonspecific content. Conclusion: Conclusion was correlated to the results and conclude the study very completely. Overall: Language needs some editing, to make the text easier to read. I hope that my concerns will help you improve your manuscript.