# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 85715

**Title:** Subintimal recanalization for non-acute occlusion of intracranial vertebral artery in an emergency endovascular procedure: A technical case report

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05476795

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-05-11

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-05-15 01:11

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-05-17 00:54

**Review time:** 1 Day and 23 Hours

| | |
|---|---|
| **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[ ] Grade D: Fair   [ ] Grade E: Do not publish |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 [ ] 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) [ ] Minor revision   [ ] 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

- Are there any metabolic anomalies in this patient that would rule out the differential diagnosis?

# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 85715

**Title:** Subintimal recanalization for non-acute occlusion of intracranial vertebral artery in an emergency endovascular procedure: A technical case report

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 02445870

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Doctor, Lecturer

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-05-11

**Reviewer chosen by:** Geng-Long Liu

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-07-03 16:01

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-07-03 19:31

**Review time:** 3 Hours

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 [  ] Grade D: Fair   [  ] Grade E: Do not publish |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

This case is interesting and well illustrated, some minor points could be considered: 1. Some terms should be improved (e.g. "correctly stress" (P3, L51,61; P13,L282) (stress?); "this article reports" (P3,L59) (this report?) 2. On the L48 the time of last clinical evaluation should be explained. 3. The text and some figures could be shortened if space is critical. 4. The line "to our knowledge, which has not been reported previously" (P4,L80-81) is unnecessary and could be deleted.