

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Dermatology

**Manuscript NO:** 35967

**Title:** Managing panniculitis in alpha-1 antitrypsin deficiency: Systematic review of evidence behind treatment

**Reviewer's code:** 00646519

**Reviewer's country:** Mexico

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2017-09-06

**Date reviewed:** 2017-09-21

**Review time:** 15 Days

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Describe correctly the inheritance pattern Describe a DNA or protein level the genotype/phenotype of the variants What was the genotype in each patient with respect his/her treatment, it should be mentioned Was there genotype/treatment respond? What was the evolution of the disease (AATD) in each patient? Unfortunately meta-analysis was not done, this had enriched the manuscript

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Dermatology

**Manuscript NO:** 35967

**Title:** Managing panniculitis in alpha-1 antitrypsin deficiency: Systematic review of evidence behind treatment

**Reviewer's code:** 00646537

**Reviewer's country:** Saudi Arabia

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2017-09-29

**Date reviewed:** 2017-09-29

**Review time:** 1 Hour

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Well written narrative review The prisma diagram shows 31 papers included, but you mention 32 case reports and 4 case reports? A recent cochrane review on intravenous alpha-1 antitrypsin augmentation therapy for treating patients with alpha-1 antitrypsin deficiency and lung disease, recommended that evidence was not sufficient for the use of augmentation therapy. Although this is not for panniculitis, may be worth discussing in your discussion section

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Dermatology

**Manuscript NO:** 35967

**Title:** Managing panniculitis in alpha-1 antitrypsin deficiency: Systematic review of evidence behind treatment

**Reviewer's code:** 00646516

**Reviewer's country:** Malaysia

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2017-09-13

**Date reviewed:** 2017-10-04

**Review time:** 21 Days

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Good review However, quality of papers were low mainly case report/series Can the authors suggest reason(s) for poor response to steroids/steroid sparing agents to reduce the inflammation?