

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 73742

Title: Mass Brain Tissue Lost after Decompressive Craniectomy :a case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06219967

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-12-06

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-12-09 04:59

Reviewer performed review: 2021-12-15 05:13

Review time: 6 Days

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

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

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This article further confirms that the brain stem is the center of life. But according to this pathology, it can only be concluded that the brain stem is the center for maintaining circulation. Therefore, I suggest that the conclusion part should be slightly modified. Secondly, I would like to ask whether the authors can collect complete information about the patients which before they are transferred to your hospital. In addition, the relevant information uploaded by the author is duplicated. "Signed Informed Consent Form(s) or Document(s)" is exactly the same as "Non-Native Speakers of English Editing Certificate".

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 73742

Title: Mass Brain Tissue Lost after Decompressive Craniectomy :a case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05866874

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Physiotherapist, Professor, Senior Lecturer

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Spain

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-12-06

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-12-23 21:22

Reviewer performed review: 2021-12-23 21:41

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear authors: Thank you very much for your effort and work to be able to present this clinical case. First of all, I must tell you that it is a good work, but I would like you to clarify certain aspects: - Why there is no section on the patient's history. As the patient is referred from another hospital, he/she should bring with him/her a clinical history and talk about his/her previous pathologies and previous interventions. It is essential to know in this case what diagnostic tests were carried out previously, cranial interventions and medical treatments prescribed. - What do they mean by "Traditional Chinese Concept". In the discussion they refer to this concept but it is commented on previously and they do not specify it. Make reference to it being explained later. - The discussion section is very brief and you should make more reference to your objective and finding of the clinical case and interrelate it with current literature. - In the references section there are 13 citations, it is quite poor and there should be more current citations, please improve this section. - You should make reference to your finding with this clinical case and make it evident to the whole scientific community because otherwise there is hardly any novel contribution with your work. I hope you will take my comments and contributions into account, thank you. Regards