

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Medicine and Health</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_121808
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Cerebral Gliomatosis: delayed diagnosis and management difficulties Through a case report</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Case report</b>

#### **General guidelines for the Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript provides valuable insights into the diagnosis and management of Cerebral Gliomatosis (CG), a rare and complex brain tumor, which is crucial for advancing understanding in a relatively understudied area. The detailed case report, complemented by spectroscopic imaging data, enhances the current knowledge on the morphological and histological characteristics of CG, which could be pivotal for improving diagnostic accuracy in similar cases. Furthermore, the paper highlights the challenges in treating CG, underscoring the need for more research into effective therapies. However, the manuscript could benefit from a clearer delineation of novel findings compared to existing literature to better underscore its unique contributions to the field.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	This title is concise and emphasizes the main themes of diagnostic challenges and management difficulties, while also highlighting the significance of the pediatric aspect of the case.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract of the article provides a succinct overview of the case of Cerebral Gliomatosis (CG) and outlines the main diagnostic and prognostic tools used. However, to make the abstract more comprehensive and informative, a few additions on "Objective", "Methodological Details", "Key Findings" and "Implications" could be beneficial.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The overall structure of the manuscript, with its defined sections of Abstract, Introduction, Case Report, Discussion, and Conclusion, follows a conventional format for case reports, which is appropriate for the subject matter.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is scientifically robust, demonstrating detailed clinical and diagnostic insights into Cerebral Gliomatosis through the use of advanced spectroscopic imaging and histological analysis. It is well-supported by relevant literature, affirming the diagnosis and expanding on the complexities of this condition. The integration of clinical findings with established research underlines the technical soundness of the study, enhancing its contribution to neuro-oncology.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	<p>The references listed in the manuscript seem to cover essential historical and recent studies, offering a solid framework for discussing Cerebral Gliomatosis. However, the majority of cited studies appear to date from the early 2000s to 2011, which could potentially miss more recent developments and insights in the field. To ensure the manuscript remains current and includes the latest research findings, it would be beneficial to include more recent references, particularly from the last five years.</p> <p>For a more comprehensive and up-to-date perspective, I would recommend looking into the latest issues of major neuro-oncology journals such as "Journal of Neuro-Oncology," "Neuro-Oncology," and "Clinical Neurology and Neurosurgery" for recent studies on similar topics. This can help in enhancing the relevance and depth of the manuscript, ensuring that it reflects the most current knowledge and methodologies in the diagnosis and management of Cerebral Gliomatosis. Including these recent studies would also support the manuscript's conclusions and potentially provide new insights into emerging diagnostic techniques or therapeutic approaches.</p>	

**Review Form 3**

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article is generally suitable for scholarly communication, with clear and precise use of technical terminology appropriate for a scientific audience. However, there are minor issues that could be addressed to enhance clarity and professionalism:</p> <p>Consistency: Ensure consistent terminology, especially with the disease name—either consistently use "Cerebral Gliomatosis" or "Gliomatosis Cerebri" throughout the document.</p> <p>Grammatical Precision: Some sentences could be revised for better grammar and flow. For instance, avoiding run-on sentences and ensuring correct use of commas and other punctuation marks can improve readability.</p> <p>Technical Descriptions: Some technical descriptions might be overly complex or dense for readers not familiar with the specific field. Simplifying these without losing essential information could make the manuscript more accessible.</p> <p>Addressing these points will enhance the overall readability and ensure that the manuscript meets the high standards expected in scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Here are some general comments and suggestions to enhance the manuscript further:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Interdisciplinary Impact: Discuss implications for neurology, oncology, and radiology to broaden the research's relevance and audience.</li> <li>2. Visual Clarity: Ensure all figures are high-quality and clearly labeled. Consider adding diagrams to outline the diagnostic process and disease progression.</li> <li>3. Management and Ethics: Elaborate on management strategies and ethical considerations in treatment decisions, particularly for pediatric cases.</li> <li>4. Future Research: Clearly suggest future research directions, focusing on therapeutic developments and diagnostic improvements.</li> <li>5. Collaborative Review: Involve experts from pediatric neurology and oncology in the review process to enhance the manuscript's credibility and depth.</li> </ol>	

**PART 2:**

	<p><b>Reviewer's comment</b></p>	<p><b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i></p>
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Kai Xiao
Department, University & Country	Canada