



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 85544

Title: Revitalizing case reports: Standardized guidelines and mentorship

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 01551432

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: India

Manuscript submission date: 2023-05-04

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-05-15 09:45

Reviewer performed review: 2023-05-18 11:44

Review time: 3 Days and 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation



Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Editor, Thanks for your assignment for reviewing the submitted manu in WJCC. I think the manuscript topic is very interesting, however, many criticisms should be addressed as below. I think the manu will be accepted in WJCC after fully and proper revising. Major and minor The summary does not match the flow of the text. This is an elementary flaw. Where did the main point come from that "a garaphical abstract must be adopted"? Please add to your discussion a further enumeration of the rationale, evidence, and factors that have contributed to the dramatic decline in case reporting. We believe that a general description of the five main standardized SEASONS is unnecessary. It makes little sense. Please delete them or provide a shortened description of only the main points. Rather, please explain and discuss the significance and usefulness of each SECTION as a case report, how it is recommended to be described, and the rationale behind it, citing references, and if not, specifically explaining and discussing the author's opinion, knowledge and experience gained from previous experiences. The related editorial in Figure 1 is interesting and appreciated; it would be better to delete or shorten the description of the five main SECTIONS and increase this



**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

SECTION and the author's discussion sufficiently. Page 7, line 4: It is stated that case reports are infrequently cited, which reduces the IF of the journal, but since they are case-specific reports and studies, the scope of the content is narrow and the expertise of the readers is limited, resulting in a small number of readers, The report has the important role of searching for similar reported case series, examining them thoroughly, and advocating their characteristics and future research topics. Page 7, line 10: There is no difference or bias in the process of publication of case report articles depending on the department. Case reports from all departments are useful and do not differ. The description is childish and could be misleading as it is biased. Page 7, line 19 What is a retrospective study? Please provide sources and details about the study.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 85544

Title: Revitalizing case reports: Standardized guidelines and mentorship

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05213310

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Adjunct Professor, Full Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Saudi Arabia

Author's Country/Territory: India

Manuscript submission date: 2023-05-04

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-05-21 08:17

Reviewer performed review: 2023-05-21 11:53

Review time: 3 Hours

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
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation



Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Auhtor(s), Please make the following small changes: 1/ I propose that the author(s) change the title of the article and shorten it in order to be more consistent with the existing article's purpose. 2/ The study's abstract appears to be excessively broad. I hope the author(s) will make it more scientific by outlining the existing article's goals/objectives. 3/ The conclusion section of the study abstract should be rephrased. 4/ I would want the author(s) to improve image No. 1 by providing a logical sequence demonstrating the strategies for publishing a case report. 5/ Some of the references in the article are out of date and should be updated, as well as utilizing references from 2023 and at least five years beyond that. //Good Luck//



RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 85544

Title: Revitalizing case reports: Standardized guidelines and mentorship

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 01551432

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: India

Manuscript submission date: 2023-05-04

Reviewer chosen by: Li Li

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-05-31 03:46

Reviewer performed review: 2023-05-31 09:16

Review time: 5 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" 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
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Authors, Thank you for your submitting the revised manuscript entitled, "evitalizing Case Reports in Medical Literature: Improving Acceptance, Novelty, and Impact Through Standardized Guidelines and Mentorship" in WJCC. I think the manuscript is properly revised accordingly and will be accepted in WJCC. Thank you again in this phase of manuscript editing. Takuya Watanabe, MD, PhD. Niigata, Japan