

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 82811

Title: Investigation of possible relationship between atopic dermatitis and salivary biomarkers, stress and sleep disorders

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02496065

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Brazil

Author's Country/Territory: Brazil

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-28

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-12-29 17:06

Reviewer performed review: 2022-12-29 17:10

Review time: 1 Hour

	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C:
Scientific quality	Good
	[] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	 [] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair
this manuscript	[] Grade D: No creativity or innovation



Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	 [] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No scientific significance
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

None



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 82811

Title: Investigation of possible relationship between atopic dermatitis and salivary biomarkers, stress and sleep disorders

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03259005

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: DSc, MD, PhD

Professional title: Chairman, Full Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Ukraine

Author's Country/Territory: Brazil

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-28

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-01-10 22:48

Reviewer performed review: 2023-01-31 10:00

Review time: 20 Days and 11 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [Y] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish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



Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous
statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I have review your manuscript "Putative Salivary Biomarkers in the Evaluation of Stress and Sleep Disorders in Patients with Atopic Dermatitis: Narrative Review" and while the article provides interesting information, on the other hand, there are discrepancies in the data and regards to assessments. I would ask to work for points as below: 1. The Title "Putative Salivary Biomarkers in the Evaluation of Stress and Sleep Disorders in Patients with Atopic Dermatitis: Narrative Review" doesn't reflect presented in MS material. First, it should be presented in a concise, informative, and easily understandable style. Other, at the same time it should be evidence-based and not repeat previous publications. The term "putative" doesn't fit well for non-experts. Finally. Also, is it narrative review? This absent strategy of search literature, what are the inclusive and exclusive criteria of selection references for review? And what is the novelty if selected publication didn't include papers about modern sensors which use saliva biomarkers? 2. Keywords: Please use the list of structured keywords from the Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) of the US National Library of Medicine (https://www.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/meshhome.html) 3. Funding support or grants, conflict of interest information is not presented 4. The authors should follow similar terms and follow scientific correct terms. For example: what are the differences between "psychological stress" or "emotional stress"? The sentence: [Most compounds that appear in the bloodstream.] needs correction. We can't evaluate substances or compounds in blood flow, we could do in biofluids. The presented data of salivatory biomarkers is without the key ones which reflect stress condition, glucose (the main molecule which related to metabolic changes during stress response), glutamate (the



indicator of cognitive functions0, as well as others. Authors should use illustrative instruments (Tabs, Figs) which will help readers to understand material in Manuscript. To sum up, 1. In its current form, it will be difficult for most readers to easily understand. 2. I will reconsider and review the updated manuscript after those clarifications. Overall, this is an important contribution to the literature that could greatly benefit from a careful review and editing process with notification of study limitations