

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 27178

**Title:** Primary pediatric mid-brain lymphoma: Report of a rare pediatric tumor in a rare location

**Reviewer's code:** 03316783

**Reviewer's country:** France

**Science editor:** Shui Qiu

**Date sent for review:** 2016-05-17 15:06

**Date reviewed:** 2016-06-07 03:02

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input 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 type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The standard dose brain irradiation may be discuss. Morris JCO 2013 proposed a lower dose:23.4 Gy ; JCO 2016 Glass: 36 Gy line 52 Burkitt

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 27178

**Title:** Primary pediatric mid-brain lymphoma: Report of a rare pediatric tumor in a rare location

**Reviewer's code:** 02446446

**Reviewer's country:** Syria

**Science editor:** Shui Qiu

**Date sent for review:** 2016-05-17 15:06

**Date reviewed:** 2016-06-10 06:55

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 type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input checked="" 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

Remarks to authors: The case report entitled "Primary pediatric mid-brain lymphoma: report of a rare pediatric tumor in a rare location", is about very rare tumor in children comprising About 1.5 % of all primary CNS lymphoma. The report of this case have diagnostic value since it is frequently misdiagnosed as relatively more common entities, such as gliomas. The case has been reported coherently. However, some items in the paper should be revised. I have the following observation: 1.The diagnosis of the case needs more precise interpretation, not only B cell non-Hodgkin's l lymphoma ?!. we can't rule out Diffuse large b-cell lymphoma (DLBCL). For proper evaluation; immune stains for Bcl- 2 and Bcl-6 are recommended. 2.The Quality and resolution of the Figure 2 are poor, please provide better figures & explanation of histopathology (H&E) & immune stains such as (G). 3.Some typographical mistakes need t be corrected.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 27178

**Title:** Primary pediatric mid-brain lymphoma: Report of a rare pediatric tumor in a rare location

**Reviewer's code:** 00182548

**Reviewer's country:** Romania

**Science editor:** Shui Qiu

**Date sent for review:** 2016-05-17 15:06

**Date reviewed:** 2016-05-26 23:57

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

This is a very rare location of a lymphoma in a teenager. The case presentation is interesting. Did he have side effects induced by chemo- or radiotherapy? The figure 2G has no explanation. There are several grammatical errors that must be corrected.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 27178

**Title:** Primary pediatric mid-brain lymphoma: Report of a rare pediatric tumor in a rare location

**Reviewer's code:** 00209021

**Reviewer's country:** Turkey

**Science editor:** Shui Qiu

**Date sent for review:** 2016-05-17 15:06

**Date reviewed:** 2016-06-06 13:53

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 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"/> 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 type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

-Did the authors give any intrathecal treatment? -What was the name of treatment protocol they used?  
 -Is the PET imaging a suitable modality for staging work-up in high grade lymphoma and especially in case of CNS involvement? -Could the systemic chemotherapy with intrathecal chemotherapy have been an alternative to craniospinal radiotherapy to prevent CNS toxicity? -The authors would rather discuss other choices of treatment such as intrathecal rituximab.