

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Pediatrics

ESPS manuscript NO: 27795

Title: Language and cognitive outcome for high-risk neonates at the age of 2-3 years - experience from an Arab Country

Reviewer's code: 00646241

Reviewer's country: Germany

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2016-06-17 11:04

Date reviewed: 2016-07-10 17:40

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In their work, "Language and cognitive outcome for high-risk neonates at the age of 2-3 years - Experience from an Arab Country", the authors present a nice and informative, yet small single-center study analysing a cohort of 103 toddlers that had been exposed to risk factors in the perinatal period, focused on language and cognitive abilities. The study includes a comprehensive series of tests both regarding intelligence and language, but also hearing, guardian-patient interaction, and psychomotor development, thus covering the whole field of factors influencing language development. All analyses appear to have been done diligently, and in particular the statistical analyses are well done. A severe weakness of the study is the small number of patients included, with a very heterogeneous spectrum both of underlying diagnoses and their severity, thus making subgroup analyses difficult. For example, the outcome of moderate prematurity probably is much different compared to that of extreme prematurity. The same is true for hypoglycemia - besides, the definition of hypoglycemia that was used should be defined, as for hyperbilirubinemia etcl. Sepsis or meningitis as severe influencing factors were not mentioned - they should better be analysed



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>

separately or excluded. Further, a healthy control is lacking. The paper is well written, and the quality of English language is good. Minor points introduction instead of long-term sequelae better write long-term sequelae discussion instead of They reported the presence of white matter abnormalities in such very low-birth-weight babies impairs better write They reported that the presence of white matter abnormalities in such very low-birth-weight babies impairs

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Pediatrics

ESPS manuscript NO: 27795

Title: Language and cognitive outcome for high-risk neonates at the age of 2-3 years - experience from an Arab Country

Reviewer's code: 00503689

Reviewer's country: Egypt

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2016-06-17 11:04

Date reviewed: 2016-07-07 18:36

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Interesting study on a significantly increasing problem. More and more high risk neonates survive and are liable to mental and linguistic delays. The combined effect of some risk factors should have been more defined as for instance the effect of HIE and RDS or the effect of hearing impairment with hyperbilirubinaemia. Similarly more analysis on the degree and duration of hypoxia or hypoglycemia could have helped in stratifying the risk potential. There is no data on the small number of hearing impaired children (quite a low number given this high risk population?). What was the effect of maternal risk factors? Was there an effect of order of birth especially with parent-child interaction? What are the therapeutic or preventive measures suggested in this context? A further study should be planned to follow these patients at school age to check the long term effect and whether they will need special teaching and learning strategies on the long run

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Pediatrics

ESPS manuscript NO: 27795

Title: Language and cognitive outcome for high-risk neonates at the age of 2-3 years - experience from an Arab Country

Reviewer's code: 00069139

Reviewer's country: Thailand

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2016-06-17 11:04

Date reviewed: 2016-07-13 06:49

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a good paper analyzing association between perinatal factors and delay language development (DLD) in the following life. Manuscript preparation and language are in standard for academic presentation. Major criticise: 1. Table 6 has no meaning because the 'DLD' is diagnosed based on these parameters. For the reasons, it is not surprising there are significant different between 2 groups. If the authors would like to show the raw score, comparisons are not necessary and may mislead. 2. What is the meaning of Step 1a in the table 8? It seems that taken the 'Step 1a' out would be better. 3. These parameters should not be put onto multivariate analysis as they are not potential causative parameters, instead they are diagnostic criteria. Please consult your statistician to see these tables again. My suggestion is that this paper can end at the Table 8 and the multivariate analysis is not necessary because only 1 parameter is found to have association.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Pediatrics

ESPS manuscript NO: 27795

Title: Language and cognitive outcome for high-risk neonates at the age of 2-3 years - experience from an Arab Country

Reviewer's code: 00158184

Reviewer's country: Turkey

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2016-06-17 11:04

Date reviewed: 2016-07-15 02:55

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The structure of the study is well designed.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Pediatrics

ESPS manuscript NO: 27795

Title: Language and cognitive outcome for high-risk neonates at the age of 2-3 years - experience from an Arab Country

Reviewer's code: 02446483

Reviewer's country: Canada

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2016-06-17 11:04

Date reviewed: 2016-06-30 00:08

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The article is excellent and contains good material. It should be emphasized that subspecialty biases may corrupt some results. Thus, some of the limitations need to be emphasized. An additional aspect is the consanguinity rate that it does not seem to be highlighted in the manuscript. Finally, metabolic issues with regard to sialidosis or mucopolysaccharidoses/MPS are missing and should be retrospectively investigated. Patients with a metabolic disorder may have poor outcome and should be emphasized in the manuscript.