

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

Manuscript NO: 67527

Title: Allergic Dermatitis After Knee Arthroscopy with Repeated Exposure to

Dermabond Prineo™ in Pediatric Patients: A Report of Two Cases

Reviewer's code: 05269643 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Attending Doctor, Chief Physician, Deputy Director, Doctor, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2021-04-30

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-06-20 23:48

Reviewer performed review: 2021-06-24 08:15

Review time: 3 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Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish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	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [] 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	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous
statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No



https://www.wjgnet.com

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

[Introduction] - Language is good - There is no need to cite the topical application of Prineo[™] from manufacture's guideline. Therefore, I suggest deleting Line 80-83 (It is intended for ... guidelines). [Case presentations] - Very well written in clear language - The author stated that the first patient's TED hose were discontinued until the blisters dried up, but did not mention the second patient's TED hose during the treatment. [Discussion] - Generally, Discussion section is well written but too verbose. - For example, the authors provided 3 paragraphs (line 241-267) to describe a noticeable reduction in operating time in the use of Prineo[™]. I think such points should be in brief, because this manuscript highlighted the rare complication of Prineo[™] rather than the advantages of Prineo[™]. [Conclusion] - The first sentence is not the real conclusion from this case report; please delete it. - Line 280 and 282, I prefer "case report" to "case series" because there are only 2 cases in this manuscript. [Figures] - Figure legends need to be rephrased to provide robust and "stand alone" information, if a reader viewed only that Figure without reading the text. [References] - Appropriate



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

Manuscript NO: 67527

Title: Allergic Dermatitis After Knee Arthroscopy with Repeated Exposure to

Dermabond Prineo™ in Pediatric Patients: A Report of Two Cases

Reviewer's code: 05112656 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Chief Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: South Korea

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2021-04-30

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-06-19 10:35

Reviewer performed review: 2021-06-26 00:37

Review time: 6 Days and 14 Hours

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



https://www.wjgnet.com

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In the case where several studies have already been conducted, even if the subject of the cases are pediatric patients, it is not considered to be a unique or new message.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

Manuscript NO: 67527

Title: Allergic Dermatitis After Knee Arthroscopy with Repeated Exposure to

Dermabond Prineo™ in Pediatric Patients: A Report of Two Cases

Reviewer's code: 05172135

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2021-04-30

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-06-19 07:37

Reviewer performed review: 2021-07-02 22:22

Review time: 13 Days and 14 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) [Y] Accept (General priority) [] 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

well written, facing an underestimated complication of a device of increasing use. the schematic approach is excellent. Good is the final discussion.