

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 28392

**Title:** Culturally adapted pictorial screening tool for autism spectrum disorder: A new approach

**Reviewer's code:** 00504545

**Reviewer's country:** Spain

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2016-07-01 18:45

**Date reviewed:** 2016-07-19 16:38

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"/> [ Y] Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [ Y] Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [ Y] 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"/> 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"/> [ Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		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"/> [ Y] No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I think this paper is very useful for clinical assessment of these children of the attics spectrum and is very simple and reproductiv

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 28392

**Title:** Culturally adapted pictorial screening tool for autism spectrum disorder: A new approach

**Reviewer's code:** 02446483

**Reviewer's country:** Canada

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2016-07-01 18:45

**Date reviewed:** 2016-08-31 21:20

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 paper is very interesting. PAAS may be indeed an effective tool in screening for ASD. The addition of a visual aid in the form of photographs improves its sensitivity. The authors claim that further study is indicated to evaluate the feasibility of using this instrument for community screening for autism. The manuscript can be improved by adding a table comparing their system with the benchmark and add kappa values for different assessors.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 28392

**Title:** Culturally adapted pictorial screening tool for autism spectrum disorder: A new approach

**Reviewer's code:** 00068723

**Reviewer's country:** Japan

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2016-07-01 18:45

**Date reviewed:** 2016-09-02 12:33

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 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 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 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 type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This study investigated PAAS for the screening of ASD. The ASD scoring system is potential useful. Table 1 was easy to understand PAAS. The authors stated that M-CHAT is not reliable for culturally varied populations. This point should be clearly presented in Introduction. PAAS seemed a good method. But the superior point of PAAS to M-CHAT was not clear. This manuscript did not show how to score and evaluate based on PAAS. Were the PAAS results a summation of Yes" of question of PAAS? How was the scoring system? How were the sample children determined ASD or not? In discussion, it would be appropriate to compare M-CHAT and PAAS.