

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 81460

Title: Imaging features of retinal hemangioblastoma: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06179533

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MSc

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Turkey

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-11-24

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-11-24 11:02

Reviewer performed review: 2022-11-26 09:24

Review time: 1 Day and 22 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 Grade E: Do not publish
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	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous

statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [<input type="checkbox"/>] Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No
------------	--

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1 Title. Appropriate 2 Abstract. Appropriate 3 Key Words. Keywords should be different from the title. 4 Background. Appropriate 5 Methods. Appropriate 6 Results. Appropriate 7 Discussion. Differential diagnosis of retinal hemangioblastoma should be added. Key features to differentiate from other masses must be emphasized. 8 Illustrations and tables. The figure descriptions are careless, should be rewritten. MRI images were presented in a confusing manner. They should begin with T2 WI, after that precontrast T1WI, after that enhanced images should be presented. Are there any DWI, if present it should be given. 9 Biostatistics. N/A 10 Units. Appropriate 11 References. Appropriate 12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Average, can be upgraded. 13 Research methods and reporting. Appropriate 14 Ethics statements. No information was given, were patient's consent taken?

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 81460

Title: Imaging features of retinal hemangioblastoma: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05321957

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Slovenia

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-11-24

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-12-01 09:12

Reviewer performed review: 2022-12-09 12:02

Review time: 8 Days and 2 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 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

The authors have described the imaging features of retinal hemangioma from a perspective of radiologist. Retinal hemangiomas can usually be observed directly and diagnosed by eye fundus examination. I suggest that this is included in the introduction, since this is the main reason why radiologists do not often perform diagnostics of retinal hemangiomas. Physical examination needs an improvement in english ophtahlmological terminology. Few examples: What is meant by "naked eye"? Perhaps: visual acuity without correction? "External eyes of both eyes"? Probably: periocular? The term "hematocele in the anterior chamber" is not correct, it should be "hyphema"

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 81460

Title: Imaging features of retinal hemangioblastoma: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06179533

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MSc

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Turkey

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-11-24

Reviewer chosen by: Li-Li Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-12-26 04:29

Reviewer performed review: 2022-12-26 20:20

Review time: 15 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
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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The recommendations were performed, thank you.