

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 81079

Title: Manifestation of the malignant progression of glioma following initial intracerebral hemorrhage: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05394499

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Germany

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-10-24

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-10-24 15:23

Reviewer performed review: 2022-10-24 17:21

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[] Grade A: Priority publishing [] Grade B: Minor language polishing [Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	 [] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[]Yes [Y]No



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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Authors, this an interesting case presenting the complexity of differential diagnosis in bleeding intracranial malignancies. The extensive diagnostic work-out of your case and intellectual background support the conclusion that brain tumors may be misdiagnosed if covered by hemorrhage and characteristics of perihematomal edema may lead to differential diagnosis. In order to optimize the grammatical and structural quality of your paper I suggest the revision by a native English speaker. Best Regards



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 81079

Title: Manifestation of the malignant progression of glioma following initial intracerebral hemorrhage: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06409390

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Tunisia

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-10-24

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-11-02 03:56

Reviewer performed review: 2022-11-18 10:04

Review time: 16 Days and 6 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[] Grade A: Priority publishing [] Grade B: Minor language polishing [Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	 [] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No



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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Specific comments to authors: 1. English editing is needed through all the manuscript 2. The authors must define each abbreviation before its first use in the text 3. Abstract: The authors should elaborate a short coherent abstract respecting the order of CARE checklist: Don't separate sentences with titles (Patient concerns, Interventions, Diagnosis..) 4. Key words: use MeSH terms 5. Introduction: References should be reordered The years of these percentages must be indicated: incidence.. 3.7 to 7.2%... Define the abbreviation of CT 6. Case presentation: Define the abbreviation of MRI 7. The authors should respect this order to describe the case: Patient information including past history / Clinical Findings/ Diagnostic Assessment/ Therapeutic Intervention/ Follow-up and Outcomes 8. Assessing the case presentation objectively avoids emotions: Unfortunately! 9. Conclusion: to avoid repetition , the author should elaborate the "take-away" lessons of this case report in a one paragraph conclusion