

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 59270

Title: Management of corneal ulceration due to temporary lagophthalmos in a brain injury patient by moisture chamber use: A case report

Reviewer's code: 03700188

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor, Attending Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Brazil

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-09-02

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ru Fan

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-11-11 17:55

Reviewer performed review: 2020-11-11 21:26

Review time: 3 Hours

Scientific quality	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	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
https://www.wjgnet.com

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The title reflects the main subject of the manuscript and the abstract summarize well the work described in the manuscript. The key words reflect the focus of the manuscript. The manuscript discusses the paper's scientific relevance to clinical practice. The authors didn't write the word 'point' to describe the score at Glasgow scale. There are few references, but they are cited appropriately in the introduction and discussion sections. The manuscript is concisely and coherently organized and presented and the language and grammar are accurate and appropriate. The author submitted the related formal ethics documents that were reviewed and approved by their local ethical review committee.