

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 32054

Title: Pseudotumoral acute cerebellitis associated with mumps infection in a child

Reviewer's code: 00732160

Reviewer's country: Tunisia

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-12-26

Date reviewed: 2017-01-20

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> [] The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> [] High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] 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"/> [Y] 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 type="checkbox"/> [Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Introduction Line 3: replace suffer severe forms "with brainstem involvement" by related to brainstem compression. Line 6: replace "etiology" by etiopathology Case report: Line 11: Ill-defined hypodense lesion Line 16: replace "and producing cerebellar mass-effect" by with mass effect Line 19: Magnetic Resonance Spectroscopy showed mildly reduced NAA/Creatine ratio with doublet of lactate peak at 1.3ppm. Discussion Line 4: replace by Several infectious agents associated with cerebellitis were reported in literature Line 5: Rubella and not rubeola Important to discuss the role of Magnetic Resonance Spectroscopy (MRS) in the differential diagnosis between tumour and cerebellitis and if MRS can be prognosis tool. Figure 2 : Magnetic Resonance Spectroscopy (TE=35ms) showed mildly reduced NAA/Creatine and normal Choline/Creatine ratios. Doublet of lactate peak (1.3 ppm) was detected.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 32054

Title: Pseudotumoral acute cerebellitis associated with mumps infection in a child

Reviewer's code: 03340448

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2017-01-22

Date reviewed: 2017-01-23

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting and rare case with pseudotumoral acute hemispheric cerebellitis, due to mumps virus. Received 22th Jan, 2017, and reviewed 23th Jan, 2017. I have some minor comments only. Page 3). Please insert a reference for the sentence "Acute cerebellitis is usually a benign disease" Page 3). Does she have a history of mumps immunization before onset? Please state in the Case Report. Page 4, Fig. Legends). Use ". " and ", " correctly. Ex) 0,9 ppm to 0.9 ppm Figure 1 a, 1b, and 1C) Please point the lesions by ? or ?. Figure 2. Please explain which peak show NAA, Creatine and Choline, respectively. See above

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 32054

Title: Pseudotumoral acute cerebellitis associated with mumps infection in a child

Reviewer's code: 00172269

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2017-01-22

Date reviewed: 2017-01-28

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a well written paper, although not completely original. See attached file below

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 32054

Title: Pseudotumoral acute cerebellitis associated with mumps infection in a child

Reviewer's code: 00506481

Reviewer's country: India

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2017-01-22

Date reviewed: 2017-02-03

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The case report is described very well and will be useful to share with the scientific community.