

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 80861

**Title:** A review of the prevalence, diagnostics, and containment measures of the current mpox outbreak

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05687852

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Doctor, Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Taiwan

**Author's Country/Territory:** Nigeria

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-10-15

**Reviewer chosen by:** Dong-Mei Wang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-11-19 13:19

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-11-27 08:48

**Review time:** 7 Days and 19 Hours

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 Grade E: Do not publish
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

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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

This is an interesting review that highlights the global prevalence and containment measures while also depicting the human MPX spread in naive populations from non-endemic countries. Scientific findings underline the significance of unusual clinical manifestations of human MPX and the demand for additional and ongoing clinical-epidemiological studies. 1, All figures are highly professional, and the authors should guide the readers to the meaning of the images appropriately; otherwise, it is likely to cause misunderstandings. Therefore, I suggest that the author consider revising the figure and table legends again. 2, In Table 1, the author discussed the various diagnostic tests used in identifying Orthopoxvirus, including DNA markers unique to MPX. It would be fascinating to discuss more signaling pathways related to the monkeypox infection (PMID: 36067982, 36093436, 35969374, 34949827, 32320436). 3, As human to non-human transmission has been evidenced, the isolation of pets from MPXV-infected individuals should be included in the control measures. Since MPXV or SARS are viral zoonosis, and with significant epidemic potential. It would be worthwhile to discuss the recent paper in this article (PMID: 35944803, 36015017, 32615317) 4, There are few typo issues for the authors to pay attention. Please unify the writing of scientific terms. "Italic, capital" ?

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 80861

**Title:** A review of the prevalence, diagnostics, and containment measures of the current mpox outbreak

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05673135

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Switzerland

**Author's Country/Territory:** Nigeria

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-10-15

**Reviewer chosen by:** Dong-Mei Wang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-12-07 17:48

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-01-04 06:16

**Review time:** 27 Days and 12 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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

General comments: This paper aims to review the prevalence and containment of MPX (currently referred to by WHO and CDC as “mpox”). The rationale is two-fold: “...the clinical presentation must be better understood to improve containment measures...”, and “...there are currently no standardized or optimized guidelines for clinical care of MPX patients, especially in low-resource settings.” Efforts to describe emerging infectious disease outbreaks and the lessons that can be garnered from these experiences are essential for improving public health responses in the future. The authors' intention is commendable – however, the paper needs significant improvement and falls short on several key points. The methodology section is far too brief - is this a study, literature review, or mini-review? If this is a literature review, then it is incomplete, outdated (reference list should be updated and expanded), and poorly structured (scientific reporting guidelines such as PROSPERO should be used). Nevertheless, several reviews on this topic already exist (Bunge EM, et al., Titanji BK, et al., Kaler J, et al., Singhal T, et al., Cheema AY, et al., Harapan H, et al., Poland GA, et al.) Furthermore, Evans A, et al. just published a mini-review in December 2022. As such, this paper – in its current state - is not contributing substantially to the scientific literature. If this is a mini-review, it should focus on defining, describing, or comparing one or two critical aspects of the outbreak. For example, the authors could describe containment efforts undertaken among the countries/regions of the world, which includes the strengths and weaknesses, a gap analysis, and some recommendations. Or they could describe the evolution of the clinical manifestations, case definition, and diagnostic tools. Or another critical area would be surveillance



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

activities worldwide. The main shortcoming is that this paper is not broad enough for a full review, and it is not adequately focused for a mini-review. References Please review the literature for more current publications. Some potentially relevant papers the authors may want to include/discuss are mentioned above. Grey literature is used in the references. This is acceptable (and important), but it should be clearly stated in the methods. Currently, it says that only peer-reviewed papers were included in the review.