



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Manuscript NO:** 45669

**Title:** Neuroendoscopic and microscopic trans-sphenoidal approach for resection of nonfunctional pituitary adenomas

**Reviewer's code:** 00486971

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Ying Dou

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-02-27 13:05

**Reviewer performed review:** 2019-03-09 21:14

**Review time:** 10 Days and 8 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Please see the attached file.

### INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://www.wjgnet.com**

***Google Search:***

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

***BPG Search:***

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

**Attached File**

This is an important manuscript that addresses two neurosurgical approaches to resection of pituitary adenomas. The presentation of the comparison between the two neurosurgical approaches is straightforward. Clearly, this manuscript warrants publication. There are several minor issues that would be helpful to address before publication.

1. The inclusion criteria are presented, but it would be helpful to have a separate section describing exclusion criteria. The exclusions named are not adequately described. For example, the manuscript does not describe the total number of cases that were reviewed, and the number that were excluded based upon the criteria named.
2. The manuscript does not describe how the choice of neuroendoscopy versus trans-sphenoidal resection was made. It is possible that there was systematic bias introduced when one method was chosen over the other. The only way to overcome such potential systemic bias is to have randomized allocation to the treatment groups. It does not appear that that randomization occurred.
3. The formatting of the Figures has been corrupted. It may be necessary to reinsert the figures into the manuscript for clarity.
4. In Table 3, the p value for diabetes insipidus does not show a significant digit.



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](http://www.wjgnet.com)

5. In the Discussion, the last paragraph describes the shortcomings of the study. The most important shortcoming is the lack of randomization to the groups being compared. It would be helpful to include lack of randomization as one of the shortcomings of the study.
6. There are occasional typographical errors within the manuscript that should be corrected.