

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Pediatrics

Manuscript NO: 40448

Title: Perianal infectious dermatitis: An underdiagnosed, unremitting and stubborn condition

Reviewer's code: 04356732

Reviewer's country: Nigeria

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2018-06-25

Date reviewed: 2018-06-26

Review time: 1 Day

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The author of this review set out 'to critically review and summarize the available scientific literature regarding pediatric peri-anal infectious disease (PID).' The review attempted to 'provide updated information about essential aspects of PID (epidemiology,



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

etiology, pathogenesis, as well as clinical features, required investigations and therapeutic options) and of diagnostic pitfalls.' It was a well-written review with a painstaking data gathering and analysis, and an in-depth discussion. Although the review article is stated to be a narrative review, it has all the 'trappings' of a systematic review albeit without a meta-analysis; otherwise one would have advocated for the use of a PRISMA flow diagram. The following are however few minor concerns about the manuscript

MINOR CONCERNS

1. Under the Abstract, errors of syntax, punctuation and grammar are littered here and there. For instance, in the first sentence, the phrase 'of bacterial origin' could better read 'which is of bacterial origin'. Ditto for the first sentence under CORE TIP. In the fourth sentence, rather than just stating "from inception", a starting date for the Literature search should have been provided. It was however stated in the body of the manuscript. In the seventh sentence, instead of 'Other numerous conditions are initially considered', it would be better to state that 'PID may mimic other common conditions with skin manifestations (like candidiasis...)' I suspect the word 'consecutive' used here and under CORE TIP should be 'consequent'. Thus, under CORE TIP, the phrase that read 'with consecutive mistreatment' could better read 'consequent wrong application of treatment.'

2. In the Introduction, the author stated that practitioners initiate 'sometimes invasive and costly' investigations for PID. Which invasive and costly tests? Few examples could be given here. Secondly, the recounting of the author's clinic experience is adjudged a redundant statement and may need to be deleted. The aim of the review as stated in the penultimate last sentence can be abridged for clarity.

3. Under the subheading- characteristics of included studies: the term 'totalizing' can be replaced with 'totaling'

4. Under the treatment subheading, the term 'present case(s)' was unnecessarily used several times when it could have been applied once thus 'As written in Table 3, children with PID (including the present cases)....'. The term 'worryingly' could read 'worrisomely'. The abbreviation 'AB' should be dropped



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https:// www.wjgnet.com

for the full meaning which is 'antibiotics' 5. The Conclusion appears very lengthy. At a point, the author states 'Moreover, associating oral AB with topical antiseptics'. I think it would better read 'Moreover, combining oral antibiotics with topical antiseptics' 6. Table 1 is laden with too much details. Text and table should be complimentary. The current table 1 can be split into two tables 7. Just like table 1, table 2 is very bulky and can be split into two tables. Table 3 is okay in the present format

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ [Y] No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ [Y] No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Pediatrics

Manuscript NO: 40448

Title: Perianal infectious dermatitis: An underdiagnosed, unremitting and stubborn condition

Reviewer's code: 03328331

Reviewer's country: India

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2018-07-17

Date reviewed: 2018-07-26

Review time: 9 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Authors have conducted a detailed review on PID; however, there few suggestions to improve it - 1. Details of the literature search could be more specific as the date of inception is not same for all the databases. 2. Similarly, title and abstract is usually

screened first for the possible inclusion and then, full-text is being read. 3. Conclusion is too lengthy and could be shorter and crisper.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No