

December 11, 2020

Lian-Sheng Ma
Editorial Office
World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript ID number: 60599

Dear Dr. Ma

We would like to thank you and the reviewer for your detailed and very helpful suggestions on our manuscript entitled "Diabetes insipidus with impaired vision caused by germinoma and perioptic meningeal seeding: a case report and literature review" and for the opportunity to re-submit it for review. We have revised the manuscript according to your recommendations. Below, we will detail, item by item, our response to the specific suggestions.

Reviewer #1 Comments:

Comment 1

ABSTRACT Background: 1. Lacks a definition of germinoma

<Response>

Thanks for this comment. We have added a definition of germinoma in *ABSTRACT Background*.

ABSTRACT Background, line 37, page 2.

Comment 2

ABSTRACT The first line seems out of context - midline of what?

<Response>

We thank the reviewer for pointing this out. We have added "midline axis of the brain" in *ABSTRACT*.

ABSTRACT Background, line 38, page 2.

Comment 3

ABSTRACT Avoid the use of "and so on" which seems unscientific

<Response>

We greatly appreciate the suggestions by the reviewer. We have replaced "and so on" with "etc."

ABSTRACT Conclusion, line 49, page 3.

Comment 4

ABSTRAT Case summary: Instead of "bilateral optic nerve", I suggest "bilateral heterogeneous enhancement of the optic nerves..."

<Response>

Thanks for this comment. We have modified it based on your suggestion.

ABSTRAT Case summary, line 43-44, page 2

Comment 5

ABSTRAT Case summary: "enhancement of the bilateral optic nerve and atrophy of optic nerves" seems contradictory, I suggest specifying that it was the nerve sheath which was enhanced

<Response>

We sincerely thank the reviewer for this thoughtful comment. We have revised it in the text.

ABSTRAT Case summary, line 44, page 2

Comment 6

For clarity, rephrase the sentence "We summarized the case characteristics..." to indicate, that a literature review was performed Conclusion

<Response>

Thanks for your comment. We have changed the expression into "A literature review was performed to summarize the cases"

ABSTRAT Case summary, line 51, page 3

Comment 7

ABSTRAT conclusion: Rephrase "Differentiated"

<Response>

We agree with the reviewer and have changed it into "a complete differential diagnosis".

ABSTRAT conclusion, line 59, page 3

Comment 8

I suggest rephrasing to "Clinical manifestations as well as associated endocrine abnormalities depend on the location and size of the tumor"

<Response>

We thank the reviewer for this observation. We agree with the reviewer and have fixed it in the original text.

Introduction, line 83-84, page 5

Comment 9

Many of the sub-headlines are unnecessary and gives a fragmented impression - I suggest reducing the number of sub-headlines

<Response>

We agree with the reviewer for this observation. However, it is the writing requirement of the journal to have these sub-headlines.

Comment 10

A more detailed timeline would add to the clarity of the case presentation - had she been diagnosed with CDI one year prior to vision loss? Which diagnostic work-up was performed initially? What was the extent of polyuria?

<Response>

We sincerely thank the reviewer for this thoughtful comment. We have added a more detailed timeline in the case description.

Case presentation, line 99-106, page 6

Comment 11

Under the headline "lab examinations": avoid the use of "basically"

<Response>

We thank the reviewer for pointing this out. We have revised it.

Case presentation, line 125, page 7

Comment 12

Avoid the use of "and so on"

<Response>

Thank you for your comment. We have replaced "and so on" with "etc.".

Discussion, line 166, page 9

Comment 13

Discussion Rather than repeat which investigations were negative, describe the significance of the findings

< Response >

We sincerely thank the reviewer for this comment. We have deleted some negative investigations

and further describe the significance of these results in the DISCUSSION.

Discussion, line 173-178, page 9

Comment 14

Regarding the paragraph "The most common manifestation of germinoma was polyuria, while mass symptoms in the form of headaches and visual complaints were observed in approximately half of the cases. The visual complaints always occurred after DI, with a median delay of 5 months (ranging from 1 to 35)" - I suggest changing to present time, to indicate that these are general findings

< Response >

We greatly appreciate the thorough suggestions by the reviewer. We have changed it into *present time*.

Discussion, line 185-188, page 8

Comment 15

For clarity, rephrase the sentence "We summarized the case characteristics..." to indicate, that you performed a literature review

< Response >

Thanks for this comment. We have changed the expression into "A literature review was performed to summarize the cases..."

Discussion, line 203, page 10

Comment 16

Rephrase the sentence: "Most of the reported patients were adolescents within the 12–34 age range" - 34 is not adolescent

< Response >

Thank you for pointing this out. We have rephrased the sentence into "Most of the reported patients were adolescents and the age ranged from 12 to 34 years old."

Discussion, line 205-206, page 11

Comment 17

"ranging from half to twelve years", I suggest changing to "ranging from half a year to twelve years"

<Response>

Thank you for the comments. We have changed it in the article.

Discussion, line 207, page 11

Comment 18

Conclusion The first sentence should include what the authors presented

<Response>

We sincerely thank the reviewer for this thoughtful comment. We have further added it in the conclusion.

Conclusion, line 219-220, page 11.

Comment 19

Rephrase "Differentiated"

<Response>

We agree with the reviewer and have changed it into "a complete differential diagnosis"

Conclusion, line 228, page 12

Comment 20-21

TABLE 20. Correct the reference numbers 21. For clarity, author names should be cited in the table

<Response>

We thank the reviewer for the comment. To simplify the table, we have deleted the column containing "Serial [reference]" and replaced it with "Authors".

Table

Editor Comments:

(1) *The authors did not provide the grant application form(s), please prepare them*

<Response>

Thank you for the comments. We would provide the grant application forms this time.

(2) *The authors did not provide original pictures. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor*

<Response>

Thanks for this comment. We would provide the original figure documents this time.

(3) *PMID and DOI numbers are missing in the reference list. Please provide the PubMed numbers and DOI citation numbers to the reference list and list all authors of the references.*

<Response>

Thanks for this comment. We have fixed it.

Sincerely,

Huabing Zhang (on behalf of the co-authors)

Department of Endocrinology, Key Laboratory of Endocrinology

Peking Union Medical College Hospital, Chinese Academy of Medical Sciences & Peking Union

Medical College, Beijing, China

E-mail: huabingzhangchn@163.com