

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 60849

Title: Effects of early rehabilitation in improvement of paediatric burnt hands function

Reviewer's code: 05476795

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Indonesia

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-06-03

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-06-17 01:54

Reviewer performed review: 2021-06-27 10:06

Review time: 10 Days and 8 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	 [] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	 [] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[]Yes [Y]No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No



SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Maybe it's better to had a longterm follow due to their trauma / scar



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 60849

Title: Effects of early rehabilitation in improvement of paediatric burnt hands function

Reviewer's code: 05088164

Position: Associate Editor

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Romania

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-06-03

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-06-19 11:54

Reviewer performed review: 2021-06-27 20:23

Review time: 8 Days and 8 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	 [] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No



SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The title of the manuscript reflects the subject well, but it may be improved to emphasize the critical role of an early start of rehabilitation. The abstract should be improved: why is it essential to study the effects of early rehabilitation? What is the background in this subject? Also, methods and results should be improved in the abstract. Careful with the abbreviations. The keywords reflect well the focus of the manuscript. The paper is, in general, well written; the Introduction properly presents the field and the importance of this study. The material and methods section presents the data collection, with inclusion and exclusion criteria. The rehabilitation program is extensively described, including two figures. The statistical methods should be rewritten: data are expressed as mean and standard deviation and number and percentages. Too many times t-test was presented. This paragraph should be rewritten. The presentation of the results should be improved as the authors should choose one method: table or text (see data from 3.2 and 3.3 as there are also presented in the text). The authors interpret the findings adequately and appropriately. They highlighted the main points of their study concisely and logically. The discussion is accurate and revealed the study's scientific significance and relevance to clinical practice. The paper includes three figures and five tables. Some of them had data that are also presented in the text. Figure 3 may be improved. The manuscript cites appropriately essential references in the introduction and discussion sections. There are 21 references, almost 2/3 from the last 5 years. The manuscript is well organized and presented. The style and language are accurate. Just some editing and improvement of the use of the abbreviations (ROM, AROM, PROM - AROM is not defined in the text, only in the abstract, where ROM is not defined). Better to be strict with these definitions. The authors include the ethics approval and consent to The paper presents an interesting retrospective study on the participate statements. positive role of an early rehabilitation program in managing pediatric burnt hands. After



the early intervention, a significant improvement in the active range of motion was demonstrated. Also, hand function improvement was correlated with the time from onset to post-traumatic rehabilitation intervention and the lengths of the rehabilitation program. The conclusions summarize the data presented in the study, but in my opinion, it may be shortened. The authors may add a paragraph with the limitations and strengths of this study and another one on future directions on this research and the importance of future clinical practice guidelines.



RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 60849

Title: Effects of early rehabilitation in improvement of paediatric burnt hands function

Reviewer's code: 05088164

Position: Associate Editor

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Romania

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-06-03

Reviewer chosen by: Han Zhang (Online Science Editor)

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-07-20 18:57

Reviewer performed review: 2021-07-20 20:22

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	 [] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	 [] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The paper was improved based on reviewers recommendations. Still, the abbreviation



for ROM should be defined just once and then used. The paragraph with limitations of the study should be placed before conclusions, as the last paragraph of Discussion section. Some editing should also be done: -do not use - "25%- $\leq 50\%$, 50%- $\leq 75\%$ " but 25-50%, 50-75% -do not number the Conclusions with 5. - verify the text for typos.