



ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

ESPS manuscript NO: 16143

Title: Treatment strategies for multiple sclerosis: when to start, when to change, when to stop?

Reviewer's code: 00646452

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2014-12-30 08:26

Date reviewed: 2015-01-27 18:20

Table with 4 columns: CLASSIFICATION, LANGUAGE EVALUATION, SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT, CONCLUSION. It contains checkboxes for various evaluation criteria like 'Grade A: Excellent', 'Priority publishing', 'Google Search', etc.

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Major concerns: The title of the manuscript is attractive for clinicians and this kind of minireview/ editorial seems suitable for the publication in the journal. However, it is not so easy for this reviewer (even for a neurologist) to read this manuscript because there are no figures or tables to help the readers understand the therapeutic strategies for multiple sclerosis. For example, it is very hard to follow the priority and indications/contraindications for each drug because there are more than ten drugs available for current disease-modifying therapies. Thus this reviewer recommends that this manuscript should be rewritten for clear and comprehensive presentation with figures and tables. Specific comments: 1) Comprehensive description of rationale and evidence for disease-modifying drug therapies should be provided with Figures and Tables (lists) in order to understand critical factors affecting the start, change and stop. 2) Formatting of this manuscript should be corrected for this journal. For example, citation number should be put in front of period. 3) One updated reference will be included; The use of disease-modifying therapies in multiple sclerosis. A consensus paper by the Multiple Sclerosis Coalition (http://www.mscares.org/?page=dmt)

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

ESPS manuscript NO: 16143

Title: Treatment strategies for multiple sclerosis: when to start, when to change, when to stop?

Reviewer's code: 02445870

Reviewer's country: Afghanistan

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2014-12-30 08:26

Date reviewed: 2015-01-22 04:23

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript "Treatment strategies for multiple sclerosis: when to start, when to change, when to stop?" is well written, informative and useful for clinical settings. I have some points. 1. The line "...effective but at increased risk of serious adverse events..." should be explained, some of the most frequent adverse events must be included. (P5,p2,L14). 2. It would be useful a paragraph explaining that the main reason for the limited therapeutic benefits for MS is the lack of knowledge on the precise etiology. 3. The authors mention two of the most severe complications of immune-modifying therapies; VZV and JCV (P10 and 11). However, they do not explain these complications, moreover, they use the abridged terms (VZV, JCV, PML) without explaining the name of the viruses or the diseases (P10,p2,L12). A paragraph explaining the characteristics or severity of these risks should be included. 4. The line "Based on current..." must be placed above the line "when to start treatment..." (P15,p1,L1-2) so that this statement applies for all three conclusions. 5. I think that the line: (good clinical practice point) (P15,p4,L3) should be deleted, this concept would be evident for the whole manuscript.



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

ESPS manuscript NO: 16143

Title: Treatment strategies for multiple sclerosis: when to start, when to change, when to stop?

Reviewer's code: 00574024

Reviewer's country: Afghanistan

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2014-12-30 08:26

Date reviewed: 2015-01-31 09:04

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors of this review article tackle a very important subject, when to treat and when to stop treatments for Multiple Sclerosis, a progressive demyelinating disease of the central nervous system. As many times the disease is not very severe, one has to put in the balance the risks and benefits of potential therapies, especially when dealing with new treatments. I have no major suggestions. However, there are some minor syntactic mistakes that should be corrected before publication. 1) P. 5 (line 22): change "delay" for "delays" 2) P. 10 (line 12): change "next future" for "near future. 3) P. 11 (line 1): hyphenate "well-being" 4) P. 11 (line 18): It could be my printed copy but I don't understand which units are used in this line. 5) P. 13 (line 1): change "undeterminedly" for "indefinitely". 6) P. 13 (line 2): change "vigilantly" for "carefully"



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

ESPS manuscript NO: 16143

Title: Treatment strategies for multiple sclerosis: when to start, when to change, when to stop?

Reviewer's code: 02446333

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2014-12-30 08:26

Date reviewed: 2015-02-06 04:25

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting and very well written manuscript and I don't have any suggestions which could improve the quality of the manuscript.