

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 18301

**Title:** Differential diagnosis of a vanishing brain space occupying lesion in a child

**Reviewer's code:** 00227683

**Reviewer's country:** China

**Science editor:** Yue-Li Tian

**Date sent for review:** 2015-04-18 18:29

**Date reviewed:** 2015-04-21 09:14

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The case report presents a vanishing brain space occupying lesion in a child over 5 years course of recovery and MRI follow-up. The prognosis was fortunately better, although the final diagnosis were unclear for the child. Nonetheless, the authors discussed the potential differential diagnosis, and recommended that MR spectroscopy (MRS) might provide valuable diagnostic differentiation between tumor and pseudotumor lesions. The MRS may be helpful for us to identify a potential vanishing brain space occupying benign lesion from tumor lesion in clinic. I have minor comments as follows: 1. Regarding the sentence "... (B,C,D,E) axial FLAIR and coronal (F) images showing hyperintense lesion in the left temporal lobe encroaching on the adjacent brainstem with perifocal edema and mass effect..." in figure 1, please check and mark hyperintense lesion tension showed in the figure B of the figure 1. 2. Regarding the figure B of the figure 2, please also confirm the figure B of the figure 2 was coronal. 3. Regarding the figures D and E of the figure 4, please confirm the consistency of long and short ER data in the title with that shown in the figures D and E.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 18301

**Title:** Differential diagnosis of a vanishing brain space occupying lesion in a child

**Reviewer's code:** 00717554

**Reviewer's country:** Netherlands

**Science editor:** Yue-Li Tian

**Date sent for review:** 2015-04-18 18:29

**Date reviewed:** 2015-04-22 02:21

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I would like to mention the following comments: 1- The Discussion is too short. Because it seems that it is only one paragraph. If you wanted to discuss with the paragraphs after discussion, there is no clear connection with the discussion section. 2- The paragraphs after discussion should moved to somewhere before final conclusion and suggestion. Good Luck