

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568 **E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com https://www.wjgnet.com

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 68560

Title: Complete restoration of congenital conductive hearing loss by staged surgery: A

case report

Reviewer's code: 05827806 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Occupational Physician

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: South Korea

Manuscript submission date: 2021-05-27

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-06-22 15:04

Reviewer performed review: 2021-06-26 09:50

Review time: 3 Days and 18 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [Y] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[] Grade A: Priority publishing [] Grade B: Minor language polishing [Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [] No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous
statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568 **E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The findings of this case report are interesting. But the manuscript may need some revision. I am not convinced that why they add so much old references in the manuscript. The procedure of the second operation in the case introduction section was too simple. And a question, why they do the same surgery on the left ear after the first surgery on the right ear didn't work out so well. PTA should consistently compare the same side, such as the right ear. In addition, they may also provide the microscopic findings during the surgery during the right-sided ear. The discussion section is not sufficient. In particular, the discussion of diagnosis and therapy is too simplistic. Finally the manuscript requires English editing to correct the grammar and flow.



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568 **E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com https://www.wjgnet.com

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 68560

Title: Complete restoration of congenital conductive hearing loss by staged surgery: A

case report

Reviewer's code: 05821532 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Doctor, Senior Scientist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: South Korea

Manuscript submission date: 2021-05-27

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-06-19 12:38

Reviewer performed review: 2021-06-27 02:43

Review time: 7 Days and 14 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous
statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568 **E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

see attachment:

Authors reported that Completely restored congenital conductive hearing loss by staged surgery: A case report and literature review, it is interesting and significant in clinical practice. Some minor questions should be addressed:

- 1. The topic can be changed into: Complete restoration of congenital conductive hearing loss by staged surgery: A case report and literature review
- 2. Language should be polished all the paper
- 3. Figure 3 were not clear
- 4. Conclusion should be more concise