



ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Pediatrics

ESPS manuscript NO: 26973

Title: Vein of Galen malformation in a neonate: A case report and review of endovascular management

Reviewer's code: 00069139

Reviewer's country: Thailand

Science editor: Jin-Xin Kong

Date sent for review: 2016-05-03 17:40

Date reviewed: 2016-06-30 21:49

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"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		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 authors presented their experience in a rare case of cerebral arteriovenous malformation that cause cardiovascular instability in a newborn infant. Generally, the manuscript is well prepared and interesting. However, there are some typing errors and suggestions; 1. Abstract contains inadequate data and is not attractive. More details of the case might help. 2. Ref 4 might be in the wrong place and wrong style. 3. Page 5: multiple verb repeats 4. Page 5: 'Doppler studies' is not a formal terminology for this study., Page 6: 'Lasix' as well. 5. Page 7: please consider style consistency. 6. Figure 2 does not interest the reader and can be omitted. 7. Discussion is a bit lengthy.