

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 58035

**Title:** Fascial space odontogenic infections: Ultrasonography as an alternative to magnetic resonance imaging

**Reviewer's code:** 02520718

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Professor

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

**Author's Country/Territory:** Saudi Arabia

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-07-21

**Reviewer chosen by:** Jin-Lei Wang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-10-31 15:07

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-10-31 15:27

**Review time:** 1 Hour

|                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| <b>Scientific quality</b>       | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good<br><input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish            |
| <b>Language quality</b>         | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing<br><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)<br><input checked="" 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<br>Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No   |

## **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

The authors compared whether ultrasonography performs as well as MRI in detecting fascial space odontogenic infections. They showed that ultrasonography has the potential to detect most fascial space odontogenic infections. Therefore, I would conclude that when a subject is suspect for a fascial space odontogenic infections the clinician can start with ultrasonography. MRI is then only needed when the ultrasonographic examinations is negative and there is clinically a high suspect that a fascial space odontogenic infection is present or when assessing facial spaces that not or not well can be reached with ultrasonographic examination. Minor comments

- In the abstract is written that 'The agreement between USG and MRI in the detection of fascial space infection was 100%. Ultrasonography showed 42 (84%) of 50 involved fascial spaces.' This is not correct as the agreement between both techniques is not 100% (as also already can be read in the second sentence).
- Add to the results the PPV, NPV, sensitivity and specificity of both techniques.
- With regard to the mention of the figure in the results section. Do not describe what can be seen in the figures, but what is seen in the figures.
- What is meant by stages of infection in table 2.
- I am puzzled by figure 5. This is not a proper way to drain an abscess. Or is this figure just an illustration to collect pus for culturing?

## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 58035

**Title:** Fascial space odontogenic infections: Ultrasonography as an alternative to magnetic resonance imaging

**Reviewer's code:** 02520718

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Professor

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

**Author's Country/Territory:** Saudi Arabia

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-07-21

**Reviewer chosen by:** Jia-Ru Fan

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-11-30 07:04

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-11-30 14:21

**Review time:** 7 Hours

|                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| <b>Scientific quality</b>       | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good<br><input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish            |
| <b>Language quality</b>         | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing<br><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)<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection             |
| <b>Peer-reviewer statements</b> | Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous<br>Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No   |

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Please make the legend to figure more explanatory, e.g., a .... is inserted in the ..... space to collect purulent material.. I could not fill in ..... as the image was not sharp enough to see what exactly was done. Also provide an image with a higher resolution