

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 86454

Title: Confusing finding of quantitative fluorescent polymerase chain reaction analysis in invasive prenatal genetic diagnosis: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 07722267

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-06-19

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-08-07 06:28

Reviewer performed review: 2023-08-10 11:54

Review time: 3 Days and 5 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 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 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This article discusses a case report and claims that the combination of QF-PCR, karyotyping and CNV-Seq could achieve a higher detection rate and accuracy for the prenatal diagnosis of chromosomal disorders. However it has certain short falls. 1) In literature there are multiple articles on utility of combination of QF-PCR, karyotyping and CNV-Seq for prenatal diagnosis. Then how is this case report is different from those reports? 2) In the discussion section, the author has elaborately wrote about the different methods for prenatal diagnosis and its advantages and disadvantages. I would suggest that the authors re-write the discussion in a much short and crisp manner. 3) The authors start the introduction with QF-PCR but the discussion with 45XYY syndrome. I would suggest authors to start their discussion with utility of different diagnostic tools for pre-natal diagnosis and then later discuss briefly about the 45XYY. Overall, it is any interesting case, but the authors have to focus on the novelty of the case and discuss it appropriately.