Editorial Office

World Journal of Clinical Pediatrics

Re: Manuscript No. 40448: Revision of Manuscript

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

August 22 2018

Dear Dr. Fang-Fang Ji, Science Editor, Editorial Office,

I thank you very much for giving me the opportunity to submit a revised version of my manuscript and for your suggestions.

I am grateful to the reviewers for reading my manuscript and for their very helpful comments/suggestions. As indicated in my point-by-point responses below, I have addressed all reviewers' comments. The manuscript has been duly revised accordingly.

I feel that the novel version of the manuscript has considerably improved and do hope that this revised version of the manuscript will be found suitable for the *World Journal of Clinical Pediatrics.*

I am looking forward to your answer.

Yours sincerely,

Daniela E. Serban MD PhD
Associate Professor of Pediatrics
Senior Consultant in Pediatrics
Pediatric Gastroenterologist
President of the IBD Committee of RoSPGHAN
"Iuliu Hatieganu" University of Medicine and Pharmacy
2nd Department of Pediatrics
Emergency Hospital for Children
5 Crisan str, 400177 Cluj-Napoca, Romania
Phone: +40-264-532216
email: danitiserban@yahoo.com or daniela.serban@umfcluj.ro

Response to Editor's comments on the edited manuscript file

Editor's comment:
When you send back, please provide the format of doc, not the pdf. Thank you!

Response: The revised manuscript is prepared as a doc format.

Editor's comment:
We checked the paper by crosscheck, there are similar sentences (highlighted in the report) with other articles, please see details on the crosscheck report and rewrote these sentences.

Response: I rewrote or deleted the sentences, except for the following points:
Nr. 7 – My name and affiliations, which cannot be changed.

Editor's comment:
For manuscripts submitted by non-native speakers of English, please provided language certificate by professional English language editing companies.

Response:
This was done. The language certificate by a professional English language editing company (Filipodia) will be submitted together with the revised manuscript

Editor's comment:
Please offer the audio core tip, the requriment are as follows: In order to attract readers to read your full-text article, we request that the first author make an audio file describing your final core tip. This audio file will be published online, along with your article. Please submit audio files according to the following specifications: Acceptable file formats: .mp3, .wav, or .aiff

Response:
The audio file was done (in .mp3 format) and will be submitted together with the revised manuscript.

Response to reviewers' comments

Reviewer 1 (04356732)

Scientific quality: Grade B Very good, Language evaluation: Grade B Minor language polishing, Conclusion: Minor revision.

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, 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.

Response: I very much thank the reviewer for the positive appreciation of the manuscript and for the insightful comments that follow.

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.'

Response: I thank the reviewer for the attentive review and important suggestions. I apologize for those errors. Following the reviewer's suggestions, all changes were made in the revised manuscript.

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.

Response: I thank the reviewer for addressing this important point. Examples are provided in the revised manuscript.

Secondly, the recounting of the author's clinic experience is adjudged a redundant statement and may need to be deleted.

Response: I thank the reviewer for this remark. According to the reviewer suggestion, these sentences were deleted in the revised manuscript.

The aim of the review as stated in the penultimate last sentence can be abridged for clarity.
Response: I thank the reviewer for bringing this to my attention. The sentence was clarified.

3. Under the subheading- characteristics of included studies: the term 'totalizing' can be replaced with 'totaling'
Response: I thank the reviewer for this observation. I changed the word accordingly.

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)….'.

Response: I thank the reviewer for this suggestion. I know some data were redundant. However, I could not cite myself, since there was no previous publication. Following the reviewer's suggestion, the term 'present cases' appears in the treatment subheading of the revised manuscript only once; the rest was deleted.

The term 'worryingly' could read 'worrisomely'.
Response: I thank the reviewer for this correction. The word 'worryingly' was replaced by 'worrisomely' in the revised manuscript.

The abbreviation 'AB' should be dropped for the full meaning which is 'antibiotics'
Response: I thank the reviewer for this suggestion. Following the reviewer observation, 'antibiotics' replaced the abbreviation 'AB' in the text.

5. The Conclusion appears very lengthy.
Response: I thank the reviewer for pointing out this inconsistency. Conclusion was shortened.

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'.
Response: I thank the reviewer for this suggestion. The verb was changed.

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

Response: I thank the reviewer for pointing this aspect out. Redundant data was removed from the text or Table 1. Table 1 was split in two Tables (1 and 2).

7. Just like table 1, table 2 is very bulky and can be split into two tables.
Response: I thank the reviewer for pointing this aspect out. Redundant data was removed from the text or Table 2. Table 2 was split in two Tables (3 and 4).

Table 3 is okay in the present format
Response: I thank the reviewer for the appreciation. Table 3 becomes now Table 5.

Reviewer 2 (00504077)

Scientific quality: Grade B Very good, Language evaluation: Grade B Minor language polishing, Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Response: I thank the reviewer for the positive appreciation of this review and the conclusion of the evaluation.

Reviewer 3 (03328331)

Scientific quality: Grade C Good, Language evaluation: Grade B Minor language polishing, Conclusion: Minor revision.

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.
Response: I thank the reviewer for giving me the opportunity to clarify the search method. Details of the literature search were added in the revised manuscript.

2. Similarly, title and abstract is usually screened first for the possible inclusion and then, full-text is being read.
Response: I thank the reviewer for this for this remark. The revised manuscript was written accordingly.

3. Conclusion is too lengthy and could be shorter and crisper.
Response: I thank the reviewer for bringing this to my attention. Conclusion was shortened and it appears now more accurate.