

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-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 61495

Title: Secondary injuries caused by ill-suited rehabilitation treatments: Five case reports

Reviewer's code: 05117907 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Academic Fellow, Academic Research, Postdoc, Surgeon, Teaching

Assistant

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Croatia

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-12-21

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-04-15 11:50

Reviewer performed review: 2021-04-15 12:12

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Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish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) [Y] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No



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

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Very well written with very good points and suggestions. It is my experience that family compliance is enhanced with written instructions for rehabilitation, were the families and patients given any type of material to take home? Perhaps you may wish to give flyers or pamphlets on rehabilitation for home use since verbal instructions are quickly forgotten. Perhaps add a little more detail on the length of rehabilitation treatments for each patient. How long were they supposed to rehabilitate, how long did they actually, was rehab only at home or were there scheduled appointments, how often? English is acceptable and sentence structure is well written.



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-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 61495

Title: Secondary injuries caused by ill-suited rehabilitation treatments: Five case reports

Reviewer's code: 05080957 Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: DNB, MBBS, MD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-12-21

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-04-15 04:20

Reviewer performed review: 2021-04-21 05:18

Review time: 6 Days

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 [Y] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[]Yes [Y]No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568 **E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Greetings I read your manuscript. You have highlighted an important aspect of rehabilitation related injuries in burn patient. While the manuscript has new message, I have a few minor concerns Title: Please replace the term 'inappropriate' with a better term, e.g. ill-suited. Inappropriate appears to denote malpractice, while these are actually preventable complications. Keywords: Use MeSH words The manuscript is too lengthy. Please try to shorten it.



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-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 61495

Title: Secondary injuries caused by ill-suited rehabilitation treatments: Five case reports

Reviewer's code: 04405553 **Position:** Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MCh, MS

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-12-21

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-04-16 05:11

Reviewer performed review: 2021-04-27 12:12

Review time: 11 Days and 7 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [Y] 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
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No



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

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. Title. The title is appropriate and it reflects the main subject which the author wants to highlight. 2. Abstract. In the conclusion part of the abstract, separate message can be given to the people/patients and the stake holders of the health care system to improve quality care towards burn rehabilitation. 3. Key words. No. 1. Secondary injury 2. Case report : are not appropriate key words 4. Background The manuscript adequately describes the background, present status and significance of the study. 5. Discussion. It mainly elaborates the problem in the administrative part of development of 3 tier health care facility for burn rehabilitation which is being repeated multiple times in the manuscript and in the conclusion at the end. Rather than it should discuss the scientific part of burn rehabilitation methods and common mistakes. Also the discussion part does not include the experiences and methodology by other authors which is the gist of discussion. No scientific knowledge is imparted at the end of discussion. 6. References. Too many number of reference has been cited which are irrelevant to the topic under discussed. Many mistakes in reference writing style like reference no 4, 6, 8,11,15 is incorrect . 7. Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. The introduction and case report part is well written in detail. But discussion part is not well scripted. 8. Conclusion: It is not well formulated. Again it highlights the administrative problems in rehabilitation of burn victims which is already mentioned in the discussion.