

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

ESPS manuscript NO: 14917

Title: The use of steroids for facial nerve paralysis after parotidectomy: A Systematic Review

Reviewer code: 00730449

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2014-10-30 16:35

Date reviewed: 2014-11-13 17:59

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"/> Existing	<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"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Overall, this study is well conducted and written. However, the its impact is modest: The clinical usage of steroid to improve the facial nerve recovery after parotidectomy is generally not practised worldwide. The finding of this sytematic review is just to reinforce our usual practice of not advocating steroid for this purpose. The results of this study will not change our current clinical pracitce nor convey any new knowledge in this field.

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

ESPS manuscript NO: 14917

Title: The use of steroids for facial nerve paralysis after parotidectomy: A Systematic Review

Reviewer code: 02512856

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2014-10-30 16:35

Date reviewed: 2014-11-10 18:47

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"/> Existing	<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	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a very well conducted systematic review. The lack of RCT that addresses the research question is an important limitation. However, this review could motivate future research that shed light on this issue. One study included all patients undergoing parotid surgery, whilst the other included those who developed a FNP- This should be stated on Table 1.