

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 75959

**Title:** Considerations of single-lung ventilation in neonatal thoracoscopic surgery with cardiac arrest caused by bilateral pneumothorax: A case report

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 03475479

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-02-23

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-02-23 22:45

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-02-24 03:42

**Review time:** 4 Hours

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 Grade E: Do not publish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



**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

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: [ <b>Y</b> ] Anonymous [ ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [ <b>Y</b> ] No
-------------------------------------	---

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

Authors showed a neonatal case with bilateral pneumothorax during thoracoscopic surgery. In present case, single-lung ventilation induced bilateral pneumothorax and managed carefully after operation. This case can provide useful information for clinicians. In Figure 3, the images of chest X-ray should be shown clearly. In present form, the condition of pneumothorax was hard to be understood. Several grammatical errors were found. The manuscript should be checked by a native speaker.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 75959

**Title:** Considerations of single-lung ventilation in neonatal thoracoscopic surgery with cardiac arrest caused by bilateral pneumothorax: A case report

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05630740

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** South Korea

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-02-23

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-02-24 05:14

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-02-28 04:33

**Review time:** 3 Days and 23 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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

Criteria Checklist for New Manuscript Peer-Review 1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? [Yes] 2 Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? [Yes] 3 Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? [Yes] 4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? [Yes] 5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? [Yes] 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? [I did not sense that the case report strongly adds to currently existing knowledge in this particular field.] 7 Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically? Are the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner? Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper's scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently? [The discussion does fulfill most of the journal's (aforementioned) criteria and is considered to be appropriate; however, I believe that it should be edited for brevity. It is lengthy & extensive which isn't characteristic of clinical case reports. I would advise the authors to revise the discussion section firstly for brevity and consider highlighting key academic points or learning pearls. As mentioned, although authors declare learning a valuable lesson through the reporting of the clinical case, newly added knowledge or concepts were unclear to me. However, if these suggestions are implemented accordingly, I believe

the work is worthy of consideration for publication in this journal.] 8 Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents? Do figures require labeling with arrows, asterisks etc., better legends? [Yes] 9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? [N/A] 10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? [Yes; but be cautious of abbreviations used ie. “mg” as opposed to “milligram” in the prose when spelling out “1” as “one” or “two,” etc.] 11 References. Does the manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections? Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references? [Overall the references are appropriately cited however, the reference list is also lengthy uncharacteristic of case reports; I advise the authors to review the current reference list and consider decreasing the number of sources in coordination with their revised “discussion” section appropriately] 12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate? [As aforementioned, the discussion section is lengthy; please reconsider revising the section being cautious to highly key academic pearls. Please see a few edits included in the original word document—highlighted in red & yellow.] 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? [Yes.



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](http://www.wjgnet.com)

Authors are commended for a very nice work in this area] 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? [Yes; although patient consent form was in the original Chinese language—it may be advantageous for future submission, to have an officially translated version of the consent form used for submission purposes.]

## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 75959

**Title:** Considerations of single-lung ventilation in neonatal thoracoscopic surgery with cardiac arrest caused by bilateral pneumothorax: A case report

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 03475479

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-02-23

**Reviewer chosen by:** Jia-Ping Yan

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-04-13 08:10

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-04-13 13:53

**Review time:** 5 Hours

<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 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
<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**

Revised manuscript was well addressed and well written. I think this report is informative for clinicians.