

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 27856

**Title:** Clinical profile and outcomes of pediatric endogenous endophthalmitis: A report of 11 cases from South India

**Reviewer's code:** 00505049

**Reviewer's country:** Taiwan

**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2016-06-20 17:16

**Date reviewed:** 2016-07-11 09:42

| CLASSIFICATION                                    | LANGUAGE EVALUATION  | SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT                          | CONCLUSION   |
|---|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing     | Google Search:                                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good       | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing           | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title        | <input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair            | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected                           | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism            | <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor            |  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No         | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision                |
|   |  | BPG Search:                                    |  |
|   |  | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title        |  |
|   |  | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication |  |
|   |  | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism            |  |
|   |  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No         |  |

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This manuscript entitled "Clinical profile and outcomes of pediatric endogenous endophthalmitis - A report of 11 cases from South India" was to study the clinical profile and outcomes of pediatric endogenous endophthalmitis from a tertiary eye hospital in South India. Authors described 10 of the 13 eyes underwent a core vitrectomy at an average on the second day after presenting. And they found out five of 11 vitreous aspirates showed isolates, the incriminating organisms were bacteria in three and fungus in two. An underlying predisposing factor was found in seven patients. Outcome was good in 6 eyes and four eyes ended up with phthisis bulbi while one child died of systemic complications. This is an interesting study and well written. Only two comments for authors to revise, 1) Table 1, Follow up time should be marked "months" 2) Table 1, Final outcome should write "Phthisis bulbi" not only Phthisis.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 27856

**Title:** Clinical profile and outcomes of pediatric endogenous endophthalmitis: A report of 11 cases from South India

**Reviewer's code:** 00505209

**Reviewer's country:** Poland

**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2016-06-20 17:16

**Date reviewed:** 2016-07-13 04:36

| CLASSIFICATION          | LANGUAGE EVALUATION                             | SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT     | CONCLUSION                        |
|-------------------------|---|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| [ Y] Grade A: Excellent | [ Y] Grade A: Priority publishing               | Google Search:            | [ Y] Accept                       |
| [ ] Grade B: Very good  | [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing           | [ ] The same title        | [ ] High priority for publication |
| [ ] Grade C: Good       | [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing | [ ] Duplicate publication | [ ] Rejection                     |
| [ ] Grade D: Fair       | [ ] Grade D: Rejected                           | [ Y] No                   | [ ] Minor revision                |
| [ ] Grade E: Poor       |   | BPG Search:               | [ ] Major revision                |
|                         |   | [ ] The same title        |                                   |
|                         |   | [ ] Duplicate publication |                                   |
|                         |   | [ ] Plagiarism            |                                   |
|                         |   | [ Y] No                   |                                   |

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I consider this study to have valuable data that would be of interest if published. Since this endogenous endophthalmitis is a very rare disease this paper is a very useful contribution into the field of pediatric ophthalmology. So I commend it for publication without changes.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 27856

**Title:** Clinical profile and outcomes of pediatric endogenous endophthalmitis: A report of 11 cases from South India

**Reviewer's code:** 00505045

**Reviewer's country:** Turkey

**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2016-06-20 17:16

**Date reviewed:** 2016-07-23 23:37

| CLASSIFICATION                                    | LANGUAGE EVALUATION   | SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT                          | CONCLUSION   |
|---|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent       | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing                 | Google Search:                                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title        | <input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing  | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair            | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected                            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism | <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor            |   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No         | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision                |
|   |   | BPG Search:                                    |  |
|   |   | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title        |  |
|   |   | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication |  |
|   |   | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism            |  |
|   |   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No         |  |

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors submitted paediatric cases with endogenous endophthalmitis. It is well written. Language is good except very few spelling errors. Organisation of table is good. Misdiagnosis of five cases by other doctors may be defined as undiagnosed or "could not diagnosed correctly" I congratulate the authors for collecting these cases of endogenous endophthalmitis in paediatric age which are seen very rarely.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 27856

**Title:** Clinical profile and outcomes of pediatric endogenous endophthalmitis: A report of 11 cases from South India

**Reviewer's code:** 00505087

**Reviewer's country:** Greece

**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2016-06-20 17:16

**Date reviewed:** 2016-07-27 21:12

| CLASSIFICATION   | LANGUAGE EVALUATION   | SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT                          | CONCLUSION   |
|--|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent            | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing                 | Google Search:                                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept                        |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title        | <input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good                 |   | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing  | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism            | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor                 |   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision     |
|  | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected                            | BPG Search:                                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision                |
|  |   | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title        |  |
|  |   | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication |  |
|  |   | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism            |  |
|  |   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No         |  |

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The study is a fair attempt to record all cases of endogenous endophthalmitis in children at a tertiary care centre. It is well written and comprehensive. However some points need to be corrected in order it can be considered for publication. In particular: 1. The results section in the abstract should have less content and only core information. 2. The authors should define what they call a good result 3. Do the authors have any measurement of the visual acuity in children? 4. How do the authors define endophthalmitis? Did they discriminate endogenous endophthalmitis from chorioretinitis? 5. Some more pictures of other cases are encouraged to be included 6. The authors should move all of their results to the appropriate section and not in the materials and methods section.