

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

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 69163

Title: Severe bleeding after operation of preauricular fistula: A case report

Reviewer's code: 05937294 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor, Research Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Iran Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-06-29

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-06-29 10:27

Reviewer performed review: 2021-06-30 13:25

Review time: 1 Day and 2 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [] Anonymous [Y] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA

Telephone: +1-925-399-1568 **E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors present an interesting case who developed severe bleeding following preauricular fistula operation. There are a few minor issues that should be addressed by the authors before consideration for publication: 1. Were the patient's coagulation tests normal? Didn't you notice much bleeding during the operation? 2. The authors should explain how their findings make a difference for otolaryngologists around the world and the readers of the World Journal of Clinical Cases? 3. According to what criteria or classification system you stated that the patient had "severe" bleeding? 4. How about the patient's vital signs on arrival? Tachycardia? Orthostatic hypotension? SpO2? More minor issues that should be addressed include: 1. Page 3, first paragraph of introduction, the word "common" doesn't seem to fit context. Consider replacing it with "commonly".

2. Page 3, history of past illness, it seems that the preposition "in" is incorrect here. Consider changing it with "on". 3. Page 5, third part of discussion, the verb "was" doesn't agree with the subject. Consider changing it with "were".



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

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 69163

Title: Severe bleeding after operation of preauricular fistula: A case report

Reviewer's code: 05936182 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Thailand

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-06-29

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-07-01 07:01

Reviewer performed review: 2021-07-01 07:13

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA

Telephone: +1-925-399-1568 **E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Firstly, thank you for opportunity to review very interested article. 1. The title reflect the main subject about severe bleeding after operation of preauricular fistula. The title was clear and easy to understand. 2. The abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript. 3. The key words reflect the focus of the manuscript. 4. The manuscript adequately describe the background, present status, and significance of the study. The authors explain rarely complication from past to present with increase number for that. 5. The manuscript describe methods in adequate detail, study subjects were clear, but not demonstrate IRB number or text to human ethics consideration. I suggest the authors explain about ethics consideration in human research. 6. The research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study. 7. The manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly, and logically. 8. Figures sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents. 9. The manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics. 10. The manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections.