

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Methodology*

Manuscript NO: 80611

Title: Pandemic and precocious puberty - a Google trends study

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05915429

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: BSc, MSc

Professional title: Reader in Health Technology Assessment

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: Greece

Manuscript submission date: 2022-10-06

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-10-20 04:38

Reviewer performed review: 2022-10-20 06:42

Review time: 2 Hours

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 Grade E: Do not publish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

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1) Discuss few more factors which influences the search trends of any particular disease among general population apart from COVID-19 situation, mention it in the introduction section. 2) In the introduction section please discuss the physiological changes or challenges observed in male and female due to PP. Discuss in short how it may affect a society. 3) Usually a online consensus form can be circulated in facebook or any other popular social media site specifically in a region of a country to acquire the understanding of a population about a disease. In that online form researchers can seek for informations like the 'were you ever affected by PP' or 'any close friend or family member suffered from PP'. This type of method used for acquiring epidemiological information could be highly effective. 4) Google search trends can be influenced by certain factors like a circulating video in social media platform as a government's initiative to increase consciousness on a disease. Once a educated viewer watches such video, chances are high that he/she study more in google regarding that disease. However such person would learn about the disease briefly not everything. Using google search trend deep searches on terms and websites informing correct and detail

knowledge how many persons have studied online should be focussed. Not just PP patient's parents perform google search to learn about the health consequences. 5) Google search trends and facebook online consensus form can be compared suggesting the population affected over a period of time within a given region over a period of time and the increase/decrease of awareness on that disease. At the same time literatures from the same region the number of studies published can be searched from google scholars to find the reported prevalence rate of a disease. In under developed regions, literatures can very poorly suggest prevalence rate of a disease. 6) Number of patients increase as per literatures and prevalence rate of a disease are two different facts. Check what is the prevalence rate and incidence rate of PP as per WHO refer that in the manuscript. 7) Please discuss the factors causing the rising number of PP stated by literatures. 8) Discuss about how the literatures on PP were acquired in methods section. 9) Core tip should be concise and short declaring aim and results/findings. Here introduction section is almost the size of core tip, this does not looks good. 10) As I can see that this study found that there is increase in disease incidence as per literatures at the same time there is rise in consensus among general population regarding PP. Why there is an increase among general people that authors can study the results obtained from google search trend to suggest about it. 11) In abstract subheading 'discussion' term should be changed to conclusion.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Methodology*

Manuscript NO: 80611

Title: Pandemic and precocious puberty - a Google trends study

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05467628

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MBBS

Professional title: Doctor, Research Fellow

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: Greece

Manuscript submission date: 2022-10-06

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-11-15 01:22

Reviewer performed review: 2022-11-15 02:57

Review time: 1 Hour

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 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 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

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	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 have submitted an interesting and well-written work describing an analysis of google trends using keywords related to precocious puberty. The authors' methodology is appropriate and they seem to comply with STROBE reporting. While their work is meaningful, it needs some improvement. Given below are my comments in no particular order: 1. Methods section should be further expanded. Please use subheadings to carefully describe your data collection methodology, analysis plan, analysis tools, statistical tests utilized, etc. 2. The language at several places seems to be quite informal and would benefit from being more thoughtful. At several instances, it was felt that such language was contributing to a sense of overstatement. E.g. "It would be expected that a true increase in the incidence of PP would also be aptly reflected in Google Trends (after all, it is young people – particularly parents - who are concerned about PP and are particularly engaged with the internet)." 3. Authors do not compare findings of their work with similar google trends based analysis done during COVID pandemic on related fields. They should do so. 4. A visual description (figure) of secular changes in trends (changes over time) would add value to the manuscript.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Methodology*

Manuscript NO: 80611

Title: Pandemic and precocious puberty - a Google trends study

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05467628

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MBBS

Professional title: Doctor, Research Fellow

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: Greece

Manuscript submission date: 2022-10-06

Reviewer chosen by: Jing-Jie Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-12-02 14:43

Reviewer performed review: 2022-12-02 17:37

Review time: 2 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
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<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
Peer-reviewer statements	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

I thank the authors for engaging in peer-review. While I have some reservations about the article, it is unlikely that the manuscript will improve further. It has some limitations and issues, despite which it seems appropriate for publication in this journal.