ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Otorhinolaryngology
ESPS manuscript NO: 12619
Title: Experimental models of cholesteatoma: review
Reviewer code: 01214365
Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong
Date sent for review: 2014-07-18 10:16
Date reviewed: 2014-07-24 17:54

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[Y] Accept
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] Existing	[ ] High priority for
[Y] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of	[ ] No records	publication
[ ] Grade D: Fair	language polishing	BPG Search:	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade E: Poor	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	[ ] Existing	[ ] Minor revision
		[ ] No records	[ ] Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

It is a detailed review, mainly regarding to the animal models of cholesteaoma over the past decade. It is easy to read as the main points are concise and indicated clearly. Overall, there is no particular problem I suppose. If possible, you may add a table for further information to support your study.

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[Y] Accept
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] Existing	[ ] High priority for
[Y] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of	[ ] No records	publication
[ ] Grade D: Fair	language polishing	BPG Search:	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade E: Poor	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	[ ] Existing	[ ] Minor revision
		[ ] No records	[ ] Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

it is an interesting paper on animal models of cholesteatoma. maybe a table summarizing negative and positive aspects of each of the four models is of value

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[Y] Accept
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] Existing	[ ] High priority for
[Y] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of	[ ] No records	publication
[ ] Grade D: Fair	language polishing	BPG Search:	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade E: Poor	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	[ ] Existing	[ ] Minor revision
		[ ] No records	[ ] Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors have presented a review on experimental models of cholesteatoma. The manuscript is interesting and within the scope of the World Journal of Otorhinolaryngology. It can be considered acceptable for publication in its current form. Minor corrections include the following: 1) More correct use of the definite and indefinite articles throughout the manuscript. 2) Introduction, point 4, line 3: replace "achieved" with "devised". 3) Subheading Eustachian tube blocking model with ligation or electrocauterization, paragraph 1, line 4: add the word "blockage" after "Eustachian tube". 4) Subheading Chemical reagant injection, paragraph 1, line 15: replace "seems" with "seem". 5) Subheading Chemical reagant injection, paragraph 1, line 15: replace "hyalourinic" with "hyalouronic". 6) Subheading Bone marrow samples of mice for osteoclastogenetic activity and cell cultures: replace "osteoclastogenetic" with "osteoclastogenic".

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] Existing	[ ] High priority for
[ ] Grade C: Good	[Y] Grade C: A great deal of	[ ] No records	publication
[Y] Grade D: Fair	language polishing	BPG Search:	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade E: Poor	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	[ ] Existing	[ ] Minor revision
		[ ] No records	[Y] Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The title reflects the materials and methods section, but the introduction does not give a good guide to the content of the manuscript. Hence, what is the actual aim of this review? The author talks about origin of cholesteatoma in the introduction, but then reports on methodical studies where cholesteatoma was artificially generated. Naturally, this is not how cholesteatoma forms in human. Hence, these studies cannot clarify this question. This leaves the question open, what the author wants to achieve with his review. If he wants to show what methods have been used to artificially produce cholesteatoma, then he should state so in the introduction. If you just want to demonstrate methods of experimental studies, then state so in the introduction. Some sentences are hard to understand. The English must be improved, help of a native speaker is recommended. In the individual chapters, paragraphs ought to be inserted to separate the studies from each other. Methods: Every 2nd sentence starts with "they", not nice to read. The results of the individual studies are just reported, but there is no conclusions drawn from this. There are no pros and cons. There is no critical discussion of the studies. Hence, what is the achievement of the author? You do not require a researcher of clinician to list the content of some studies without having a clear plan. Currently, your review adds no new information to what is known in the literature.