# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 82201

**Title:** Positioning and design by computed tomography imaging in neuroendoscopic surgery of patients with chronic subdural hematoma

**Provenance and peer review**: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05401900

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Iran

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-12-16

**Reviewer chosen by:** Dong-Mei Wang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-01-08 11:00

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-01-09 07:34

**Review time:** 20 Hours

| | |
|---|---|
| **Scientific quality** | [  ] Grade A: Excellent   [  ] Grade B: Very good   [  ] Grade C: Good<br>[ Y ] Grade D: Fair   [  ] Grade E: Do not publish |
| **Novelty of this manuscript** | [  ] Grade A: Excellent   [  ] Grade B: Good   [ Y ] Grade C: Fair<br>[  ] Grade D: No novelty |
| **Creativity or innovation of this manuscript** | [  ] Grade A: Excellent   [  ] Grade B: Good   [ Y ] Grade C: Fair<br>[  ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation |

| Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript | [   ] Grade A: Excellent    [   ] Grade B: Good       [   ] Grade C: Fair [ Y] Grade D: No scientific significance |
|---|---|
| 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)   [   ] Accept (General priority) [   ] Minor revision   [ Y] Major revision   [   ] Rejection |
| Re-review | [   ] Yes   [ Y] No |
| Peer-reviewer statements | Peer-Review: [ Y] Anonymous    [   ] Onymous |
| | Conflicts-of-Interest: [   ] Yes   [ Y] No |

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you for your submission. Your manuscript was an interesting read. But the manuscript is not well organized and does not follow a clear flow. Please see the following comments about how your data could be further clarified:    • According to the title of the manuscript, there is no useful and appropriate explanation in this regard in the introduction section. • Most of the explanations in the introduction lacked references. • In part (Minimally invasive neuroendoscopic surgery positioning and techniques), the authors have not specified according to which technique or reference the points A, B, C, and D have been measured. Does the technique used have no specific reference? • Specific and useful information is not provided in the results section. It is not clear what the result of this study was. These presented materials are not related to the results section. • Most of the parts and materials presented in the discussion section have no references. • There is no reference from lines 119 to 136. • There is no reference from lines 139 to 167. • Most importantly, based on what results, such discussions have been raised?    • The explanations of CT scan and MRI in the case presentation section do not have scientific explanations. CT scan images, MRI, and histology images are

2

mentioned in the draft, but none of these images are uploaded in the manuscript. • Most of the parts and materials presented in the discussion section have no references. There is no reference from lines 119 to 136. There is no reference from lines 139 to 167. Most importantly, based on what results, such discussions have been raised?

# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

| | |
|---|---|
| **Scientific quality** | [  ] Grade A: Excellent   [ Y] Grade B: Very good   [  ] Grade C: Good<br>[  ] Grade D: Fair   [  ] Grade E: Do not publish |
| **Novelty of this manuscript** | [ Y] Grade A: Excellent   [  ] Grade B: Good   [  ] Grade C: Fair<br>[  ] Grade D: No novelty |
| **Creativity or innovation of this manuscript** | [ Y] Grade A: Excellent   [  ] Grade B: Good   [  ] Grade C: Fair<br>[  ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation |

| Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript | [ ] Grade A: Excellent   [ Y] Grade B: Good   [ ] Grade C: Fair<br>[ ] Grade D: No scientific significance |
|---|---|
| **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)<br>[ ] Minor revision  [ ] Major revision  [ ] Rejection |
| **Re-review** | [ Y] Yes  [ ] No |
| **Peer-reviewer statements** | Peer-Review: [ Y] Anonymous  [ ] Onymous |
|  | Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes  [ Y] No |

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript is well written and I recommend acceptance.