



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

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

**Manuscript NO:** 55361

**Title:** First branchial cleft cyst accompanied with external auditory canal atresia and middle ear malformation: A case report

**Reviewer’s code:** 03655289

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Professor

**Reviewer’s Country/Territory:** United States

**Author’s Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-03-21

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-03-23 18:14

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-03-23 18:31

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](https://www.wjgnet.com)

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Thank you for your submission. This is a rare case and the authors explains their surgical approach which could be novel. However, I how did they confirm that the patient had improved hearing after that? After 19 years of worsening hearing, I wonder if they did an audiogram or some kind of hearing test as proof. T I would also recommend explaining the background and reasons for their surgical approach more than anything as I think that has value. here are grammatical errors in the manuscript that needs to be fixed