

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Otorhinolaryngology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 9061

Title: Prenatal diagnosis and management of nasal glioma

Reviewer code: 02454968

Science editor: Huan-Huan Zhai

Date sent for review: 2014-01-18 20:19

Date reviewed: 2014-01-25 17:49

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y]Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This paper does not add anything new in literature and would be more appropriate as paragraph for a book rather than an article. Seven cases are very few to perform a review. Finally, the inclusion criteria are not reported, so it is not clear if you included articles with a suspected nasal glioma, i.e. articles based on prenatal diagnosis, or if you included those based on histologic diagnosis.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Otorhinolaryngology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 9061

Title: Prenatal diagnosis and management of nasal glioma

Reviewer code: 00724431

Science editor: Huan-Huan Zhai

Date sent for review: 2014-01-18 20:19

Date reviewed: 2014-01-28 07:15

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a very well summarized review of current experience in prenatal diagnosis nasal glioma. As this is a rare condition, the medical literature consist predominantly of single case reports. I have a few critical comments on this manuscript; 1. Introdution is overlong and contains unnecessarily basic information taken from the pathology handbooks. Many aspect emphasized in the section " nasal glioma" are again discussed in the section " discussion". Introduction must be short, precise and inform about the principal aim of the study. 2. As the authors have shown only 7 cases of prenatally diagnosed nasal glioma were reported in the literature. So expression " nasal glioma is being detected with increasing frequency " is still now rather inadequate. 3. As this is the case with introduction, the section conclusion is again much too lengthy and contain repetitions . It must limited to a few most important statements. 4. As the main issue is prenatal diagnosis I would suggest to include the USS scan of a lesion or NMR image instead of clinical picture printed with permission. 5. I would suggest to abbreviate the title to : Prenatal diagnosis of nasal glioma" as this is the only aspect discussed widely by the authors.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Otorhinolaryngology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 9061

Title: Prenatal diagnosis and management of nasal glioma

Reviewer code: 00503692

Science editor: Huan-Huan Zhai

Date sent for review: 2014-01-18 20:19

Date reviewed: 2014-02-14 22:21

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The paper at hand introduces the problem of nasal glioma as well as their prenatal diagnosis and management. The authors review the literature, they screened 594 articles and selected 7 papers. The results based on the 7 cases indicate that MRI in combination with ultrasound and doppler waveform measures are important diagnostic tools in utero as well as in the first few months of life. Those techniques enable early diagnosis as well as monitoring and appropriate surgical planning. Nevertheless, nasal glioma diagnosis may only be confirmed by histological samples. However, with the help of those imaging techniques early surgical resection and more favorable outcomes are possible. The manuscript fits the scope of World Journal of ORL and is an interesting review of already existing case studies. I recommend minor revisions before publication of the manuscript and list my comments below. Detailed comments: Introduction: Page 4: There is a typo in the second paragraph, please replace encelphaloceles by encephaloceles. Methods: Page 6: Please replace “non-English language” by “studies written in non-English language”. Can you please expand a bit more on the PRISMA checklist and flow diagram that has been used for the selection of the papers? It would be great if the authors could explain the checklist and maybe add a figure of the checklist.