

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 78786

Title: Coxsackievirus A6 was the most common enterovirus serotype causing hand, foot,

and mouth disease in Shiyan City, central China

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02729532 **Position:** Editorial Board

Academic degree: MBBS, MS

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-07-19

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-07-26 02:29

Reviewer performed review: 2022-07-31 02:23

Review time: 4 Days and 23 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish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) [] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No



Baishideng Publishing

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA

Telephone: +1-925-399-1568 **E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

Peer-reviewer

Peer-Review: [] Anonymous [Y] Onymous

statements Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The study is interesting. The Discussion section can mention the limitations, if any. Also, English language usage can be improved.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 78786

Title: Coxsackievirus A6 was the most common enterovirus serotype causing hand, foot,

and mouth disease in Shiyan City, central China

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05539060 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Director, Doctor, Lecturer, Senior Researcher

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Iran

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-07-19

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-07-30 05:47

Reviewer performed review: 2022-08-11 18:54

Review time: 12 Days and 13 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Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish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) [] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No



Baishideng

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

Peer-reviewer

Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous

statements Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I had the opportunity to read your paper. The topic and findings were interesting, paper is well-written and visualized properly. I recommend publication after editing the discussion section via a complete literature review and a proper comparison with the others findings and adding the limitations. + providing the ethics code. 1. Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? Yes 2 Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? Yes 3 Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? Yes 4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? Yes 5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? Yes 6 Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study? What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field? Yes. The findings are interesting 7 Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically? Are the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner? Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper's scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently? No. The literature review is not notable and limitations of study are not mentioned. 8 Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents? Do figures require labeling with arrows, asterisks etc., better legends? they're ok 9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? they're ok 10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

SI units? they're ok 11 References. Does the manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections? Does

manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and

the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references? Yes 12 Quality of

coherently organized and presented? Is the style, language and grammar accurate and

appropriate? 13 Research methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their

manuscripts according to manuscript type and the appropriate categories, as follows: (1)

CARE Checklist (2013) - Case report; (2) CONSORT 2010 Statement - Clinical Trials

study, Prospective study, Randomized Controlled trial, Randomized Clinical trial; (3)

PRISMA 2009 Checklist - Evidence-Based Medicine, Systematic review, Meta-Analysis;

(4) STROBE Statement - Case Control study, Observational study, Retrospective Cohort

study; and (5) The ARRIVE Guidelines - Basic study. Did the author prepare the

manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting? Yes 14

Ethics statements. For all manuscripts involving human studies and/or animal

experiments, author(s) must submit the related formal ethics documents that were

reviewed and approved by their local ethical review committee. Did the manuscript

meet the requirements of ethics? The ethical code is not provided.



RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 78786

Title: Coxsackievirus A6 was the most common enterovirus serotype causing hand, foot,

and mouth disease in Shiyan City, central China

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05539060 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Director, Doctor, Lecturer, Senior Researcher

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Iran

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-07-19

Reviewer chosen by: Li-Li Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-09-05 18:46

Reviewer performed review: 2022-09-05 18:59

Review time: 1 Hour

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) [] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [] Major revision [Y] Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [] Anonymous [Y] Onymous



Baishideng **Publishing**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com https://www.wjgnet.com

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I figure the authors have not uploaded the final version. I did not notice the limitation section and other required points in discussion part. The authors have uploaded a paper with their own comments on with Chinese language like: 这是标准格式,请修改其他姓名 的格式 !! Figure 1 caption is not provided. I do not recommend the publication.



RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 78786

Title: Coxsackievirus A6 was the most common enterovirus serotype causing hand, foot,

and mouth disease in Shiyan City, central China

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02942902 Position: Editorial Board Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-07-19

Reviewer chosen by: Li-Li Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-09-06 11:34

Reviewer performed review: 2022-09-07 18:56

Review time: 1 Day and 7 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] 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) [Y] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous



https://www.wjgnet.com

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I consider this paper was properly revised according to the reviewers' comments.



RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 78786

Title: Coxsackievirus A6 was the most common enterovirus serotype causing hand, foot,

and mouth disease in Shiyan City, central China

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02729532 **Position:** Editorial Board

Academic degree: MBBS, MS

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-07-19

Reviewer chosen by: Li-Li Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-09-05 08:40

Reviewer performed review: 2022-09-09 01:39

Review time: 3 Days and 16 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] 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) [Y] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous



statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript has improved a lot. Congratulations.