

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 84350

Title: Perforating and ophthalmic artery variants from the anterior cerebral artery: Two

case reports

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 04153245 Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: BM BCh, MD, MSc, PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Egypt

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-03-10

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-03-26 02:14

Reviewer performed review: 2023-04-03 11:42

Review time: 8 Days and 9 Hours

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	[] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish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



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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Abstract It appears with some errors. Its background contains findings of the current cases. Case summery may be increased by including a brief about two cases of the paper. Also, the abbreviation "A1" should be clarified at the first appearance. Conclusion of abstract is so much. Please, reduce it. CASE PRESENTATION Please, delete the titles appearing in this section. Only, you may retain the Case 1 & Case 2 titles. There are some errors in some words like this "embrynic". Please, recheck all parts of the paper. FIGURES Quality of Fig. 1 is not so good. You may replace it by other photograph. Shape legends are also not easy to understand. Each anatomic structure appearing in the figure should be directly followed by its symbol appearing on the photographs. Also, there are other structures appearing without symbols such as dural mater. This word "dural mater" appears incorrect. The correct is dura mater.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 84350

Title: Perforating and ophthalmic artery variants from the anterior cerebral artery: Two

case reports

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05194798 Position: Editorial Board Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Director

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-03-10

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-04-04 21:15

Reviewer performed review: 2023-04-08 22:30

Review time: 4 Days and 1 Hour

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



Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] 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	[Y] Yes [] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This manuscript is a case report which introduced two rare craniocerebral artery variants. This topic is informative for neurosurgeons as anatomy of cerebral vessels is crucial for surgical procedure in this field. However, the following major and minor issues require clarification: Major 1. The case presentation of Case 1 is insufficient as it contains little information regarding this patient. In addition, methodology of autopsy is unnecessary for case presentation. Minor 1. (Abstract) Conclusion is too long and redundant. It should be summarized. 2. I worry that it's somewhat difficult to understand the presented rare anatomy variants of craniocerebral artery. Schematic illustrated figures of anatomy variants accompanied by autopsy and DSA image can help readers' understanding.



RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 84350

Title: Perforating and ophthalmic artery variants from the anterior cerebral artery: Two

case reports

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05194798 Position: Editorial Board Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Director

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-03-10

Reviewer chosen by: Yu-Jie Ma

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-05-16 04:36

Reviewer performed review: 2023-05-17 02:57

Review time: 22 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 [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
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous



statements

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The revised manuscript is improved. However, there remains some concern in this manuscript. 1. (Abstract) Second and third paragraph in Conclusion should be described in Case summary. 2. (CASE PRESENTATION) Case 1 and Case 2 should be described separately. 3. I can't find schematic Illustrated figures in Figures.