

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 89315

Title: Case report: Neuroimaging features in a patient with non-ketotic hyperglycaemic seizures

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06288088

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Iran

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-10-27

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-10-29 19:14

Reviewer performed review: 2023-11-06 18:09

Review time: 7 Days and 22 Hours

Coloratific excelite	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good
Scientific quality	[] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish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 this manuscript	 [] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] 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	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [] 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

It was a well written case report with a suitable MRI approach .I suggest accepting the case report.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 89315

Title: Case report: Neuroimaging features in a patient with non-ketotic hyperglycaemic seizures

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02705964

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: Doctor, MD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Cyprus

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-10-27

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-11-15 14:20

Reviewer performed review: 2023-11-23 10:32

Review time: 7 Days and 20 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 [] 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 [] Grade B: Good [Y] 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

Dear editor Thank you for the case report. In the abstract section, in the case presentation paragraph, the sequence for which 'the initial MRI revealed hyperintensity' is mentioned should be added. The last sentence of the same paragraph should be constructed to indicate the loss of hypointensity. In the figures ABCD IJKL and MNOP, the affected area should be indicated with a circular or oval border. In the case presentation section, the sentence 'the following day, he' should be constructed in accordance with the English case presentation. The explanation should be corrected. In line number 98, line or another finding description should be written instead of the word 'streak'. In the same paragraph, meningeal contrast enhancement was mentioned in the contrast-enhanced examination, but it was not added to the figures. It should be added. The reason why MRV, SWI, contrast application and MRS were added to this paragraph should be explained. In line 111, the names of antiepileptic and antidiabetic drugs are not required in parentheses and should be removed. In the same paragraph, what does mean 'prn' stand for? The English language in the first sentence on line 122 should be corrected. Diagnostic guideline? or criterias? on line 128, the confusion of meaning must be



corrected. What is meant to be explained in this paragraph? The expressions were not understood. It should be rewritten. Lines 140- 143 can be removed. There is no need to go into etiopathogenesis in the case report. The paragraph starting with line 154 is important. Therefore, the section related to the SWI sequence must be placed on the figures. Lines 164 to 169 are not required. Instead, vasogenic edema can simply be explained. Line 171 the word 'soft' should be replaced.