

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 71122

**Title:** Giant tumor resection under ultrasound-guided nerve block in a patient with severe asthma: A case report

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 06079065

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD, MSc

**Professional title:** Assistant Professor, Attending Doctor, Research Scientist

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Spain

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-11-06

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-11-07 09:05

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-11-07 10:58

**Review time:** 1 Hour

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 Grade E: Do not publish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 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

<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

RESPONSE TO AUTORS: General comments: With interest I read the manuscript submitted by Liu, Qian et al., who want to present a case report about a patient with severe asthma undergoing a giant tumor surgery on the left shoulder under nerve block anesthesia. This is a point-by-point review to the manuscript presented. It agrees with the comment request for reviewers suggested by the journal:

- 1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? • Reviewer's response: Yes.
- 2 Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? • Reviewer's response: Yes.
- 3 Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? • Reviewer's response: Yes, but the keyword "case report" should be added in according to CARE guidelines to better describe the purpose of this manuscript.
- 4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? • Reviewer's response: Yes.
- 5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? • Reviewer's response: No, concerning the paragraph of Materials and Methods, the method followed to perform the regional blocks should be explained more or at least, should be referred. Also, the materials (e.g.: characteristics of ultrasound probe) used should be specified. Statistics are not necessary in this study.
- 6 Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study? What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field? • Reviewer's response: Yes. Like a case report, it is not up to a sufficient, adds little of level of evidence to the body of previously published literature and lacks educational impact. Is it possible to add an educational message to this manuscript? For example, a

comparison of the postoperative outcomes or complications rate of the peripheral nerve blocks used (supraclavicular brachial plexus block and paravertebral block versus epidural block). I would be grateful if the authors would consider this. 7 Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically? • Reviewer's response: Yes. Are the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner? • Reviewer's response: Yes. Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper's scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently? • Reviewer's response: Need improving. Please, see the specific comments addressed by this reviewer in the corresponding section of this review. 8 Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents? • Reviewer's response: No, The Figure 1, 3A and 3B and the Table 1 need to be review. Please, see the specific comments addressed by this reviewer in the corresponding section of this review. Do figures require labeling with arrows, asterisks etc., better legends? • Reviewer's response: Yes. The Figure 3A and 3B need to be review. Please, see the specific comments addressed by this reviewer in the corresponding section of this review. 9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? • Reviewer's response: Yes, statistics are not necessary in this study. 10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? • Reviewer's response: Yes. 11 References. Does the manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections? • Reviewer's response: Yes. Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references? • Reviewer's response: No. 12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? • Reviewer's response: Need improving. Please, see the specific comments addressed by this reviewer in the corresponding section of this review. Is the style,



**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

language and grammar accurate and appropriate? • Reviewer's response: No. Despite providing a certificate about the language edition, there are some parts of the manuscript which make it difficult to comprehend and, need to be reviewed. Thus, this reviewer still thinks that the English language should be extensively revised to increase the cohesion of the text to make it easier to comprehend to our readers. 13 Research methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to manuscript type and the appropriate categories, as follows: (1) CARE Checklist (2013) - Case report; (2) CONSORT 2010 Statement - Clinical Trials study, Prospective study, Randomized Controlled trial, Randomized Clinical trial; (3) PRISMA 2009 Checklist - Evidence-Based Medicine, Systematic review, Meta-Analysis; (4) STROBE Statement - Case Control study, Observational study, Retrospective Cohort study; and (5) The ARRIVE Guidelines - Basic study. Did the author prepare the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting? • Reviewer's response: Yes, this study does follow the relevant guideline for reporting case reports (CARE guideline) published by EQUATOR network and the corresponding check-list has been included 14 Ethics statements. For all manuscripts involving human studies and/or animal experiments, author(s) must submit the related formal ethics documents that were reviewed and approved by their local ethical review committee. Did the manuscript meet the requirements of ethics? • Reviewer's response: No, this manuscript shows an important flaw in ethics that may be addressed. The manuscript does not specify any study approval by an Ethic Committee to conduct this case report. However, the text states that (1) an informed consent was obtained from the patient (as the patient was a 70-year-old man, the family's consent would not be necessary); and (2) The study was undertaken in strict accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki. Also, the reviewer considers that the ethic paragraph should be included in the first part of the introduction, after the introduction of the case. Moreover, the trial design is adequate for the purpose

of this manuscript, like a case report of one patient. Moreover, this reviewer addresses other important issues in a peer-review process: 1. Are there any flaws in ethics, trial design, methods, statistics? • Reviewer's response: This manuscript shows an important flaw in ethics that may be addressed. The manuscript does not specify any study approval by an Ethic Committee to conduct this case report. However, the text states that (1) an informed consent was obtained from the patient (as the patient was a 70-year-old man, the family's consent would not be necessary); and (2) The study was undertaken in strict accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki. Also, the reviewer considers that the ethic paragraph should be included in the first part of the introduction, after the introduction of the case. Moreover, the trial design is adequate for the purpose of this manuscript, like a case report of one patient. 2. Does the study follow relevant guidelines (e.g. Equator network)? • Reviewer's response: Yes, this study does follow the relevant guideline for reporting case reports (CARE guideline) published by EQUATOR network and the corresponding check-list has been included. 3. Are there any flaws in the data presented? • Reviewer's response: Although it may correspond to a misunderstanding, there is a flaw in the data presented. (Page 2 of 14; line 28): The authors stated in the abstract that a left Subclavian brachial plexus block was administered to the patient. However, the authors used in the rest of the manuscript another term (supraclavicular brachial plexus block) to refer to the study intervention. Please, the authors should keep consistent throughout the paper the nomenclature of the peripheral nerve block performed in the study. Please, "Subclavian brachial plexus block" should be changed to "supraclavicular brachial plexus block". 4. Does the study add to the literature? Have they cited previous studies? • Reviewer's response: Like a case report, it is not up to a sufficient, adds little of level of evidence to the body of previously published literature and lacks educational impact. Is it possible to add an educational message to this manuscript? For example, a comparison of the postoperative outcomes

or complications rate of the peripheral nerve blocks used (supraclavicular brachial plexus block and paravertebral block versus epidural block). I would be grateful if the authors would consider this.

5. Are there any misleading or false conclusions? • Reviewer's response: Yes, there are some conclusions without providing the sufficient argumentation alongside the manuscript. (Page 5 of 14; line 90): The authors stated that "The postoperative analgesia reached 8 hours". It would be interesting to readers adding a description of the postoperative analgesia such as the VAS values (e.g.: a success of analgesia was reached thanks to a VAS inferior to 4) or the consumption of postoperative analgesia. (Page 5 of 14; line 104): This reviewer considers that the following sentence: "Therefore, ultrasound-guided regional nerve block became a better choice", should be reviewed because this is a case report and there is no another option studied to compare with so this statement would be a false conclusion. If the authors referred to the previous sentences where they compared to the general anesthesia and epidural anesthesia, please consider reviewing the sentence. (Page 7 of 14; 151-153) The conclusion provided by this manuscript ("Ultrasound-guided brachial plexus block combined with thoracic paravertebral nerve block might provide a new anesthetic method for patients with poor cardiopulmonary function in shoulder, back and axillary surgery") may be little ambitious and oversized. The ultrasound-guided brachial plexus block and the thoracic paravertebral nerve block are worldwide extended and contemporaneous techniques so this reviewer shows his doubts about the novelty of these outcomes and therefore, about the conclusion provided by this manuscript.

Specific comments: • Keywords: According to the CARE guidelines, authors should consider adding "case report" like keyword. Also, a maximum of five keywords may be included, so the reviewer considers that the keyword "asthma" is the most irrelevant to the present study and should be deleted. • (Page 2 of 14; line 28): An international consensus about standardizing nomenclature in regional anesthesia of the abdominal

wall, paraspinal, and chest wall blocks was published some months ago in the journal of Regional anesthesia and Pain Medicine (RAPM; online citation: [http:// dx. doi. org/ 10. 1136/ rapm- 2020- 102451](http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/rapm-2020-102451)). I consider appropriate to include this reference in the description of the intervention (thoracic paravertebral block) of this study. • (Page 2 of 14; line 42-47): The authors should consider reviewing (editing and shortening) the following sentence: “Compared with general anesthesia, the incidence of deep venous thrombosis, pulmonary embolism, perioperative blood loss, postoperative hemorrhagic shock, pneumonia, respiratory depression and renal failure was significantly reduced by regional anesthesia, that can promote rapid recovery after surgery, thus reducing the length of hospital stay and medical costs”. The authors should consider changing “that can promote rapid recovery after surgery” to “which may provide a fast postoperative recovery”. • (Page 4 of 14; line 75): The authors should change “Challenge” to “challenge”. • Figure 3. It lacks a legend about the explanation of the figure. The authors have only included the abbreviations appeared in the figure. • Figure 3. The legend showing the abbreviations of the figures 3A and 3B are incorrect. The legend of the figure 3A should correspond to figure 3B and the legend of the figure 3B should correspond to figure 3A. • Figure 3. Please, consider changing “outside” and “inside” to “lateral” and “medial”, as correspond. • The authors showed in the Table 1 the detailed clinical course of asthma during the perioperative process. In the legend of the Figure 1, there is a misprint: the authors must change “coronal computed tomography image” to “chest X-ray”. This reviewer considers that the figures (Figure 2, 3A and 3B) would be enough to provide sufficient information to readers to understand properly this case. The reviewer suggests deleting Table 1 and the Figure 1. • Concerning the authors’ contributions, in my opinion, each author should notify their specific contributions to this manuscript following the ICMJE recommendations. Final decision: REVISION UNDER MAJOR CORRECTIONS. Although it is of interest, I am unable to





**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>**

consider it for publication in its current form. I, as a reviewer of this manuscript, have raised a number of points which I believe would improve the manuscript and may allow a revised version to be published in Journal of International Medical Research. If the authors can carry out the major corrections as suggested by this reviewer, I would re-consider the future revised manuscript for possible publication in the World Journal of Clinical Cases.



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 71122

**Title:** Giant tumor resection under ultrasound-guided nerve block in a patient with severe asthma: A case report

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 03905597

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Japan

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-11-06

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-11-07 12:17

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-11-15 14:48

**Review time:** 8 Days and 2 Hours

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 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
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**

This a very interesting case report describing ultrasound (US) guide nerve block. It is well written, and it will be acceptable for publication after minor revision. Minor points a) Case Report (Page 3): Addition of CT image of the huge (25cm) tumor will help understand the readers the intention of the authors. b) (Page 4): Please describe the puncture procedure more meticulously: US machine-frequency (? MHz) of the transducer. c) Discussion (Pages 6,7): Please discuss optimal US guided brachial plexus block +thoracic paravertebral nerve block more deeply. Location of puncture, probe, dosage of anesthesia, and problems and limitations of this procedure.

## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 71122

**Title:** Giant tumor resection under ultrasound-guided nerve block in a patient with severe asthma: A case report

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 06079065

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD, MSc

**Professional title:** Assistant Professor, Attending Doctor, Research Scientist

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Spain

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-11-06

**Reviewer chosen by:** Yu-Lu Chen

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-01-11 15:54

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-01-11 15:59

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Peer-reviewer</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous



**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>

statements

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

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

With interest, I read the review made by Liu et al. of the manuscript entitled “Ultrasound guided nerve block anesthesia for the resection of giant shoulder-back tumor in a patient with severe asthma: a case report” off all the . This manuscript is of interest, I am therefore able to consider it for publication in its current form in the journal.