

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 86216

Title: Variant of Guillain-Barré syndrome with anti-sulfatide antibody positivity and

spinal cord involvement: a case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06011774 Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MBBS, MMed

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Malaysia

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-06-06

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-06-29 07:33

Reviewer performed review: 2023-07-03 08:25

Review time: 4 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	[] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish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 [] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No creativity or innovation
uns manuscript	[] Grade D. No creativity of fillovation



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

Thank you for the opportunity to review this article. Personally, I had experience managing a patient with GBS positive for anti-sulfatide managed in a similar fashion. I do believe it has importance in literature with case identification and describing its features. However, while the grammar is acceptable, there are multiple errors in the use of scientific terms and statements which made the paper difficult to read. A number of corrections will need to be made before it can be considered for publication as the manuscript lacks clarity. A few examples are provided below: Shock therapy = did you mean pulse therapy? Line 35 = diminished tendon reflexes, hypotonia, abdominal distention, and constipation and urinary retention due to autonomic nerve damage. Line 93 = rotation of vision? Line 107 = mcKay's point?? Did you mean mcburneys? Turbid sound? Turbid usually used in the context of liquids Tone is described as reduced. Not low What is Bartholomew sign? Did you mean plantar or Babinski? Cervical medulla? What is that? Did you mean cervicomedullary junction or cervical cord and medulla separately? They are two different structures. Line 148 = induction of paralysis?? Was patient intubated and sedated? It would be more appropriate to include terms like



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA

Telephone: +1-925-399-1568 **E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

cytoalbuminologic dissociation to describe the csf findings if cell counts were low instead of spelling out the whole findings. Markers sent for demyelinating diseases like oligoclonal bands/aquaporin 4/anti MOG should be stated instead of just stating negative for demyelinating disease. Investigations should be summarized and an effort should be made to spell out important tests.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 86216

Title: Variant of Guillain-Barré syndrome with anti-sulfatide antibody positivity and

spinal cord involvement: a case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05336288 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-06-06

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-07-11 02:05

Reviewer performed review: 2023-07-11 17:40

Review time: 15 Hours

	[] 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 [] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [] 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
conclusion in this manuscript	[] Grade D. No scientific significance
	[] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language
Language quality	polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing []
	Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority)
	[] Minor revision [<mark>Y</mark>] 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

Intro: very long. Can be significantly shortened The purpose of the case report may be explained Case report: Very long. Only the relevant information may be clearly explained Discussion: Very long and not focused. May focus directly on the most relevant details of the literature and the important relevance to the current case Can be presented under subheadings for easier understanding Conclusion may be clearly explained