

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 84006

Title: Diagnosis based on electromagnetic navigational bronchoscopy-guided biopsied

peripheral lung lesions in a 10-year-old girl: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05242485 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: PhD

**Professional title:** Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-02-22

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-03-27 18:06

Reviewer performed review: 2023-04-03 18:32

**Review time:** 7 Days

	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ Y] Grade C:
Scientific quality	Good
	[ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair
this manuscript	[ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation



Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [ Y] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous  Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Nicely written case report. I only have some minor suggestions below: 1) "CTs cans" -> "CT scans"? 2) Please provide the vendor information for Lungpro. 3) "bronchial centerline was calculated as" -> "bronchial centerline was used as"? 4) Figure 2: Is "E" coronal view or 3D view? 5) "literature review of papers" -> "review of papers" 6) "currently used method applied" -> "current method" 7) "ultrasound beam" -> "ultrasound wave"? 8) "TBLB implementation" -> "TBLB operation"? 9) "To address these issues...": Please provide some reference here. 10) "colonization of heart valve surfaces" -> "colonization on heart valve surfaces"? 11) "colonization of valves" -> "colonization in valves"? 12) "have remained" -> "remains"? 13) "only available in some regions and countries" -> "not available in all countries of regions"? 14) "will be able to diagnose..." -> "may help diagnose"? Mind the language here given that this is only a case report.



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 84006

Title: Diagnosis based on electromagnetic navigational bronchoscopy-guided biopsied

peripheral lung lesions in a 10-year-old girl: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05378739 Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MSc, PhD

Professional title: Postdoc, Research Scientist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Poland

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-02-22

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-04-04 07:35

Reviewer performed review: 2023-04-04 08:41

Review time: 1 Hour

	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C:
Scientific quality	Good
	[ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[ Y] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair
this manuscript	[ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation



Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[Y] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] 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 statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous  Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In their manuscript Sahar sadat Sedighzadeh et al. focused on electromagnetic navigational bronchoscopy (ENB) as an emerging diagnostic tool and have investigated ENB use in children (a case of a 10-year-old girl with peripheral lung lesions who complained of a 7-day persistent fever). The idea is innovative and interesting, and I request that the article be published in its current form. The title reflected the main hypothesis of the manuscript. Abstract summarized and reflected the work described in the manuscript, Key words reflected the focus of the manuscript. The manuscript adequately described the background, present status and significance of the study. The findings show that the ENB-guided transbronchial lung biopsy is safe and effective when used to diagnose pediatric patients afflicted with peripheral pulmonary lesion-inducing disorders. The manuscript interpreted the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically. The findings and their applicability to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner. The discussion accurate and discussed the paper's scientific significance and relevance to clinical practice sufficiently. The figures 1 are sufficient, good quality and appropriately



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

illustrative of the paper contents. The manuscript cited appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections. The author prepared the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting. The author prepared the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting and the manuscript meeted the requirements of ethics. Therefore, I propose to publish this manuscript for future use in clinical practice. Some minor comments to authors: 1) Please check for typos throughout the manuscript.