

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 82810

**Title:** Inequity in the global distribution of mpox vaccines

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05531699

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Italy

**Author's Country/Territory:** India

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-12-28

**Reviewer chosen by:** Geng-Long Liu

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-03-06 08:05

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-03-06 17:26

**Review time:** 9 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

#### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Very good mini-review on a neglected topic. I feel that much deeper considerations may be useful, but I understand that the Authors were limited by word count constraints.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 82810

**Title:** Inequity in the global distribution of mpox vaccines

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 06059470

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** BCPS, MSc, PharmD, PhD

**Professional title:** Academic Research, Assistant Lecturer, Research Fellow

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Hungary

**Author's Country/Territory:** India

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-12-28

**Reviewer chosen by:** Geng-Long Liu

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-03-13 07:13

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-03-13 12:18

**Review time:** 5 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The short manuscript entitled „Inequity in the global distribution of mpox vaccines” submitted to W. J. Clin. Cases is a brief and timely summary of the situation regarding the recent monkeypox pandemic. Abstract (and please also correct in the main text of the MS): please always use full terms initially (monkeypox) and only then introduce the abbreviation (Mpox) „Public Health Emergency of International Concern” there is no need to capitalize all words instead of „lethality rate” use „case fatality risk”, which is the more appropriate term for this situation. „Keywords” instead of „Key words” I strongly suggest using the MeSH keywords instead of the present keywords (or to revise them) for better visibility Introduction: please always use full terms initially (monkeypox) and only then introduce the abbreviation (Mpox) ...70 deaths, spread across 110 countries. more detailed data on epidemiology should be provided I suggest including some explanation on the present inequalities in geographical distribution of Mpox cases. I suggest including more information about the causative agent itself. if the authors introduced the abbreviation WHO, then they should use it consistently Diagnosis and clinical course of mpox: ...its diagnosis is mainly made by polymerase



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

chain reaction (PCR)... what if molecular biology methods are not available? please go into greater detail about the affected patient population! Current context of Mpox vaccination "However, given the shortage of vaccine supplies, different countries have authorized the intradermal administration of a single dose of the vaccine for adults." were there any efficacy or real-world evidence studies to support this practice? "...as this group is at the highest risk of contracting mpox." Healthcare professionals "In contrast, African countries lack access to vaccination and to antiviral treatment which is essential for patients with severe manifestations and people at risk of severe disease [5]." here, the authors should include some potential interventions and strategies to improve the situation. please briefly discuss the Mpox pandemic in the context of the SDGs "Other key points to contain the spread of mpox." please try to rephrase the title of the table Global allocation of health resources versus mpox: This section should be the main focus of the manuscript and should be complemented with more references and discussion in the context of Mpox. I suggest at least two more paragraphs of text. Final consideration ...together with other international public health bodies...

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 82810

**Title:** Inequity in the global distribution of mpox vaccines

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05468066

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Senior Lecturer, Senior Scientist

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Bangladesh

**Author's Country/Territory:** India

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-12-28

**Reviewer chosen by:** Geng-Long Liu

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-03-15 08:48

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-03-24 06:37

**Review time:** 8 Days and 21 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

The authors intended to write a manuscript on an important and timely topic. This manuscript, however, does not significantly contribute novel ideas; rather, it is a descriptive review of the literature. Even though they have only provided a little amount of statistical information, some of them are inaccurate. This submission falls short of the requirements to be published in this reputable journal.