

ESPS Peer-review Report
Name of Journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

ESPS Manuscript NO: 10429

Title: Cranioplasty with Custom Made Alloplastic prosthetic Implant -A Case Report

Reviewer code: 02733999

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2014-03-31 16:25

Date reviewed: 2014-04-01 18:25

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

interesting topic, but it is more usual to use custom made implant based on CT scans no more than 1 mm each scan and 3D CT, and manufactured by any of established company, which is more precise. Of course, it depends on the amount of money in the health care system of each country and long term history of each department.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

ESPS Manuscript NO: 10429

Title: Cranioplasty with Custom Made Alloplastic prosthetic Implant -A Case Report

Reviewer code: 02650886

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2014-03-31 16:25

Date reviewed: 2014-04-02 20:18

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a standard method for cranioplasty.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

ESPS Manuscript NO: 10429

Title: Cranioplasty with Custom Made Alloplastic prosthetic Implant -A Case Report

Reviewer code: 02734715

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2014-03-31 16:25

Date reviewed: 2014-04-16 13:53

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This article describes a case report where shaped PMMA was used to repair a cranial defect. While the method is not novel, this case report provided a good example of the method being used in clinical practice with 18 months clinical follow-up. The case is particularly well documented with extensive figures and photographs. Unfortunately, the paper is written using poor grammar which must be corrected prior to publication. Multiple instances of incorrect usage of punctuation are present in the manuscript. The formatting of the references is also inconsistent: references 14 and 27 are formatted differently to the remaining references; references 28 and 28 use et al for the authors list, despite these papers having few authors and all authors being listed for all other citations; reference 3 has no year or place of publication. The way these references are cited in the body text is also inconsistent. There are no excuses for this inconsistency and all submitting authors should be encouraged to thoroughly proofread all submissions. The statement that "Patch testing for acrylic was done prior to the prosthesis fabrication to rule out any acrylic allergy" should be expanded or a citation given which describes the method used for testing. The size of the defect is listed as "15 x 12 cm2" which is scientifically incorrect – it should be written as "15 cm x 12 cm" or "180 cm2". I would disagree with the statement "Acrylic resin is the alloplastic material of choice for the delayed cranioplasty of a sizable defect". Despite this statement being referenced (citation 10), I would consider this an opinion as many other alloplastic materials have been used for cranial reconstruction with advantages and disadvantages over acrylic resin. The authors should clarify this this statement is the opinion of the cited author or back up such a weighty claim with further evidence (beyond the scope of this case report).

ESPS Peer-review Report
Name of Journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

ESPS Manuscript NO: 10429

Title: Cranioplasty with Custom Made Alloplastic prosthetic Implant -A Case Report

Reviewer code: 00503125

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2014-03-31 16:25

Date reviewed: 2014-04-25 03:08

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this manuscript a patient with a large skull defect was managed with a cranioplasty made using a custom made alloplastic prosthetic implant. The conclusion is that a cranioplasty made using a prefabricated poly methyl methacrylate prosthesis is inexpensive, enables a shorter operative time and has a good cosmetic result. However I really do not appreciate much that is new in this manuscript, since prefabricated prostheses are routinely used for a cranioplasty.