

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 83387

Title: Edaravone administration and its potential association with a new clinical syndrome in cerebral infarction patients: Three cases report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05291028

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Spain

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-01-21

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-01-31 12:10

Reviewer performed review: 2023-02-01 15:16

Review time: 1 Day and 3 Hours

Scientific quality	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<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
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	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

The authors present a clinical note reporting three patients with acute cerebral infarct without previous heart disease who suffered sudden death after administration of edarovone (a neuroprotective agent). The study is potentially interesting, but the manuscript can be improved according to the following suggestions:

1. Please change in the title and conclusion “associated” to “possibly associated” as we do not have a necropsy study in any of the patients described.
2. Please change “positive Babinski sign” to “presence of Babinski’s sign” in the text.
3. Typographic error in the line 85 should be corrected (“babinski”)
4. It would be interesting to include in the Discussion a comment on the fact that differential diagnostic of the acute ischemic stroke etiology in the patients described may also be with a hematological disease. This is a noteworthy aspect that should be emphasized (Expert Review of Hematology 2016; (9), 891-901). Add and comment on the reference.
5. Please check reference #1.
6. A minor revision of the English language would be desirable.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 83387

Title: Edaravone administration and its potential association with a new clinical syndrome in cerebral infarction patients: Three cases report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05189761

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MBBS, MD

Professional title: Research Fellow, Staff Physician

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-01-21

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-02-24 02:22

Reviewer performed review: 2023-02-24 02:37

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<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
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this case series authors have discussed about the implications of Edoxaban in patients with CVA. I have the following recommendations

1. Mention the NIHSS or GCS score of these patients
2. With multiple infarct in the first patient was embolic source ruled out?
3. What was the reason for using low dose statin for all the patients?
4. Why was ginkgo biloba used? is it a common practice there?
5. I am not sure why authors used multiple agents and Edoxaban? Also I am not sure whether authors want to report its use was harmful and recommend avoiding the same or they have a different message
6. Authors need to report the management practiced at their place and report the evidence for it
7. Very poor english, requires extensive english editing
8. Article flow is very poor

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 83387

Title: Edoxaban administration and its potential association with a new clinical syndrome in cerebral infarction patients: Three cases report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05527087

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: Doctor, PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Associate Research Scientist, Doctor, Lecturer, Research Associate, Research Scientist, Researcher, Science Editor, Senior Editor, Senior Researcher, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Morocco

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-01-21

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-02-23 16:10

Reviewer performed review: 2023-03-03 10:27

Review time: 7 Days and 18 Hours

Scientific quality	<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
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty

Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation
Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<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
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	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

with interest i read your paper and found it well written with good scientific soundness, the abstract is well presented as well as the cases. However, some old references must be updated, best regards