

BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242 Fax: +1-925-223-8243 E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Ophthalmology

ESPS manuscript NO: 11472

Title: Cranial Neuropathies in Sarcoidosis

Reviewer code: 00506058

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2014-05-23 21:48

Date reviewed: 2014-07-13 15:07

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[] Grade A: Excellent	[] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[] Accept
[] Grade B: Very good	[Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[] Existing	[] High priority for
[Y] Grade C: Good	[] Grade C: A great deal of	[] No records	publication
[] Grade D: Fair	language polishing	BPG Search:	[] Rejection
[] Grade E: Poor	[] Grade D: Rejected	[] Existing	[] Minor revision
		[] No records	[Y] Major revision
İ			

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Reviewer report on manuscript 20140522213737 Title: Cranial Neuropathies in Sarcoidosis The review is an interesting one and deals with an important topic. The paper is well written.



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242 Fax: +1-925-223-8243 E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Ophthalmology

ESPS manuscript NO: 11472

Title: Cranial Neuropathies in Sarcoidosis

Reviewer code: 02493552

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2014-05-23 21:48

Date reviewed: 2014-06-06 05:24

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[] Accept
[Y] Grade B: Very good	[] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[] Existing	[] High priority for
[] Grade C: Good	[] Grade C: A great deal of	[] No records	publication
[] Grade D: Fair	language polishing	BPG Search:	[] Rejection
[] Grade E: Poor	[] Grade D: Rejected	[] Existing	[Y] Minor revision
		[] No records	[] Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a comprehensive review that includes past and current knowledge in the field. There are good descriptions of the broad spectrum of symptoms according to the cranial nerve involved. Some minor revisions are suggested. There are many repetitions about the incidence of cranial neuropathies in sarcoidosis throughout the text. I believe that a comprehensible table, like Table 2 in the text, is enough. Although the review is scientifically substantiated by up-dated references, there are also a lot of outdated references. In the subsection on "The pathogenesis of neurosarcoidosis", the reference used to document the pathogenesis of the disease is wrong (4th arrow, reference 22). A brief reference to the current and emerging therapeutic strategies in neurosarcoidosis is also needed. The abbreviation of central nervous system in the subsection of facial neuropathy has already been given earlier.



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242 Fax: +1-925-223-8243 E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Ophthalmology

ESPS manuscript NO: 11472

Title: Cranial Neuropathies in Sarcoidosis

Reviewer code: 00159131

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2014-05-23 21:48

Date reviewed: 2014-07-17 18:47

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[] Accept
[] Grade B: Very good	[] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[] Existing	[] High priority for
[] Grade C: Good	[] Grade C: A great deal of	[] No records	publication
[Y] Grade D: Fair	language polishing	BPG Search:	[] Rejection
[] Grade E: Poor	[] Grade D: Rejected	[] Existing	[] Minor revision
		[] No records	[Y] Major revision
1			

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I have read with great interest this manuscript "Cranial Neuropathies in Sarcoidosis". I have the following concern: The manuscript written in a textbook style! I could not follow it easily. I would suggest rewriting it in the traditional style of case report/ series. (Background, case history, discussion) There is clear redundancy in the text; too long abstract and discussion. It sounds that figure I is not from the author's patients! Seventy three references for such report are too many