

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Oncology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJO_92089
Title of the Manuscript:	THE CNS PARANEOPLASTIC SYNDROME: A REVIEW OF THE PATHOPHYSIOLOGY.
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**l a c k o f N o v e l t y**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalirjo.com/index.php/IRJO/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The manuscript Ms_IRJO-92089 has the title "The CNS Paraneoplastic Syndrome: A Review of the <i>Pathophysiology</i>". For sure, one of the most detailed parts of the manuscript is that one which talks about the PNS pathophysiology. However, even if the paper is focused on the pathophysiology, the other paragraphs/chapters such as "clinical manifestations", "diagnosis" and "histopathology" are too short and incomplete, especially the paragraph/chapter about PNS diagnosis (there is mentioned only MRI and no other diagnostic tools; diagnostic criteria and differential diagnosis are missing, etc.). In addition, the paragraphs/chapters "diagnosis" and "histopathology" are talking nearly only about the paraneoplastic cerebellar degeneration/paraneoplastic cerebellitis, and not about the diagnosis and histopathology of PNS <i>in general</i>. A separate paragraph/chapter regarding the prognosis of PNS is completely missing. It is just written under the chapter/paragraph "managements" that "the treatment is generally complex with poor outcomes". → THUS, additional information regarding PNS must to be added.</p> <p>The chapter "associated diseases" is not clear and seems to belong to the initial tables (?). The chapter "differentials" should be added to the chapters/paragraphs "diagnosis" or "clinical manifestations". → THUS, the order of the chapters/paragraphs must be reviewed.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>On page 1, under the chapter/paragraph "introduction" the abbreviation of PNS has been used immediately. To my opinion, the term "paraneoplastic neurological syndromes" should be initially used in its whole length, even if PNS has been explained in the abstract. That's because the abstract is considered a separated part from the main text.</p> <p>On page 1, under the chapter/paragraph "introduction" it is said that "PNS could be grouped as classical and non-classical", followed by a list of examples. However, additional information regarding these PNS groups and their differences are not explained.</p> <p>On page 2, under the chapter/paragraph "pathophysiology" the clinic problem "sleep" has been mentioned twice.</p> <p>On page 3, the source of Figure 1 has been mentioned. Its use for publication might be clarified (copyright?).</p> <p>On page 4, under the chapter/paragraph "antibodies and associated neoplasia" the last rows regarding other forms of antibodies are going to be repeated identically under the chapter/paragraph entitled "newly discovered antibodies and associated neoplasia" on page 6.</p> <p>On page 4, the table 1a is incomplete (for example, the antibodies Anti-Hu are associated not only with small cell lung cancer, but also with genitourinary tumours).</p> <p>On page 9, the source of Figure 2 has been mentioned. Its use for publication might be clarified (copyright?). In addition, this diagnostic approach is quite old (Lancet Neurology 2008) and not explained in the chapter/paragraph "diagnosis".</p> <p>On page 11, the source of Figure 5 and Figure 6 has been mentioned. Again, its use for publication might be clarified (copyright?).</p> <p>Also, the use of the figures of brain MRI should be clarified (copyright?). Finally, some of the "references" are cited incompletely.</p>	
Optional/General comments	The idea of the manuscript is very good, however, the review is incomplete, even if the review is focused on the pathophysiology of PNS. Enclosed you can find some examples of reviews.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Susanne Buechner
Department, University & Country	General Hospital of Bolzano, Italy