

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Pediatrics*

Manuscript NO: 88912

Title: Systemic Juvenile Idiopathic Arthritis-Associated Lung Disease: A Retrospective

Cohort Study

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05238069

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Russia

Manuscript submission date: 2023-10-14

Reviewer chosen by: Yu-Lu Chen

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-12-06 11:26

Reviewer performed review: 2023-12-08 03:44

Review time: 1 Day and 16 Hours

	[] 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	[] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish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 [] Grade B: Good [Y] 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) [] Minor revision [Y] 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

The article showed us the symptoms with ILD, characteristics and treatments of the five patients. However, some questions should be answered and resolved. Q1: Systemic Juvenile Idiopathic Arthritis-Associated Lung Disease is derived from Arthritis, and therefore it is recommended to add management of rheumatoid arthritis. Q2: In the conclusion section of this paper: Extensive rash, serositis (especially pleuritis), full-blown MAS with transaminitis, and biologic infusion reaction are the main predictors of ILD, which might be insufficiently substantiated. It is recommended that the authors make the predictive model more convincing by collecting relevant literature and related predictors; Q3: The authors mentioned earlier that the purpose of the study was to describe the clinical and laboratory features of the disease, but the ultimate conclusion was the management of the ILD. Therefore, it is recommended to be consitent before and after. Q4: In the discussion section, it is important to focus on the clinical features of the cases and discuss them logically associated with relevant literature Q5: In Figure 3, the pathological mechanism should be described in the text and supported by relevant citations Q6: The grammatical descriptions are illogical in the sentences such that



Trisomy 21 has a patient and the expression of "a case series report" in the title correct?



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Pediatrics*

Manuscript NO: 88912

Title: Systemic Juvenile Idiopathic Arthritis-Associated Lung Disease: A Retrospective

Cohort Study

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05526454

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MBBS, MCh, MS

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: Russia

Manuscript submission date: 2023-10-14

Reviewer chosen by: Yu-Lu Chen

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-12-08 06:43

Reviewer performed review: 2023-12-19 03:34

Review time: 10 Days and 20 Hours

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



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

I congratulate the authors for their excellent effort to pen down this paper and get it published