

Patrick Massey, MD  
Louisiana State University  
Health Sciences Center  
1501 Kings Highway  
Shreveport, LA 71130  
Phone: (318) 675-6182  
Fax: (318) 613-7131  
pmasse@lsuhsc.edu

Lian-Sheng Ma, Science Editor, Company Editor-in-Chief, Editorial Office  
Baishideng Publishing Group Inc  
7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568  
E-mail: l.s.ma@wjgnet.com

July 28<sup>th</sup>, 2021

Dear Lian-Sheng Ma,

Thank you for these excellent areas of improvement. The authors have spent a significant amount of time addressing each item, which has led to a greatly improved paper. This paper provides documentation of Allergic Dermatitis after second exposure to Dermabond Prineo™ following a knee arthroscopy with pediatric patients, which we believe will help bring awareness to orthopaedic surgeons. Thank you for your essential contributions.

Sincerely,

Patrick Massey, MD, MBA  
Director of Clinical Research  
Residency Program Director  
LSU Health – Shreveport  
Department of Orthopaedic Surgery

Reviewer #1:

**Scientific Quality:** Grade C (Good)

**Language Quality:** Grade B (Minor language polishing)

**Conclusion:** Accept (General priority)

**Specific Comments to Authors:** well written, facing an underestimated complication of a device of increasing use. the schematic approach is excellent. Good is the final discussion.

Reviewer #2:

**Scientific Quality:** Grade D (Fair)

**Language Quality:** Grade A (Priority publishing)

**Conclusion:** Rejection

**Specific Comments to Authors:** In the case where several studies have already been conducted, even if the subject of the cases are pediatric patients, it is not considered to be a unique or new message.

Reviewer #3:

**Scientific Quality:** Grade C (Good)

**Language Quality:** Grade A (Priority publishing)

**Conclusion:** Minor revision

**Specific Comments to Authors:** [Introduction] - Language is good - There is no need to

cite the topical application of Prineo™ from manufacture's guideline. Therefore, I suggest deleting Line 80-83 (It is intended for ... guidelines).

Response: Removed Lines 80-83.

[Case presentations] - Very well written in clear language

- The author stated that the first patient's TED hose were discontinued until the blisters dried up, but did not mention the second patient's TED hose during the treatment.

Response: "The skin was cleaned above and below the incisions and incision sites were redressed with a non-adhesive dressing followed by soft dressings."

CHANGED to

Lines: 170-172 "The patient's TED hose were discontinued on the operative side (left) and the skin was cleaned above and below the incisions. The-incision sites were then redressed with a non-adhesive dressing followed by soft dressings."

[Discussion] - Generally, Discussion section is well written but too verbose. - For example, the authors provided 3 paragraphs (line 241-267) to describe a noticeable reduction in operating time in the use of Prineo™. I think such points should be in brief, because this manuscript highlighted the rare complication of Prineo™ rather than the advantages of Prineo™.

Response: Discussion has been revised. The section specified above regarding the noticeable reduction in operating time in the use of Prineo™ has been edited to be brief. See Lines 247-257.

[Conclusion] - The first sentence is not the real conclusion from this case report; please delete it.

Response: Removed Lines 276-277 “In conclusion, Prineo™ has shown to be advantageous as a wound closure device with regards to operative efficiency, cosmetic results, and decreased postoperative restrictions.”

- Line 280 and 282, I prefer “case report” to “case series” because there are only 2 cases in this manuscript.

Response: Changed “case series” to “case report” in lines 280 and 282.

Lines 279-282: “This case report elucidates the rare complication of allergic dermatitis following second exposure use of Prineo™. This case report also brings forth the first, to our knowledge, reported cases of such allergic dermatitis in response to Prineo™ within the pediatric population.”

[Figures] - Figure legends need to be rephrased to provide robust and "stand alone" information, if a reader viewed only that Figure without reading the text.

Response: Figure legends were rephrased to provide stand-alone information for the reader.

[References] - Appropriate

## **6 EDITORIAL OFFICE’S COMMENTS**

Authors must revise the manuscript according to the Editorial Office’s comments and suggestions, which are listed below:

**(1) *Science editor:***

1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes a case report of the allergic dermatitis after knee arthroscopy with repeated exposure to Dermabond Prineo in pediatric patients. The topic is within the scope of the WJO. (1) Classification: Two Grades C and Grade D; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: This study is well written, facing an underestimated complication of a device of increasing use. The questions raised by the reviewers should be answered; (3) Format: There are 2 figures; (4) References: A total of 21 references are cited, including 5 references published in the last 3 years; (5) Self-cited references: There is no self-cited reference; and (6) References recommendations: The authors have the right to refuse to cite improper references recommended by the peer reviewer(s), especially references published by the peer reviewer(s) him/herself (themselves). If the authors find the peer reviewer(s) request for the authors to cite improper references published by him/herself (themselves), please send the peer reviewer's ID number to [editorialoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:editorialoffice@wjgnet.com). The Editorial Office will close and remove the peer reviewer from the F6Publishing system immediately.

2 Language evaluation: Classification: Two Grades A and Grade B.

3 Academic norms and rules: The authors provided the informed consent. No academic misconduct was found in the Bing search.

4 Supplementary comments: This is an unsolicited manuscript. No financial support was obtained for the study. The topic has not previously been published in the WJO.

5 Issues raised: (1) The authors did not provide original pictures. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor; and

Response: Original pictures were arranged on a PowerPoint and uploaded for revision.

(2) PMID numbers are missing in the reference list. Please provide the PubMed numbers and DOI citation numbers to the reference list and list all authors of the references. Please revise throughout. 6 Re-Review: Required. 7 Recommendation: Conditional acceptance.

Response: PubMed numbers were added to the references. There was one reference that did not have a PubMed ID so it could not be added. All authors were listed in the citations for each reference.

***(2) Company editor-in-chief:***

I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, the full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Orthopedics, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors. Before final acceptance, uniform presentation should be used for figures showing the

same or similar contents; for example, “Figure 1 Pathological changes of atrophic gastritis after treatment. A: ...; B: ...; C: ...; D: ...; E: ...; F: ...; G: ...”.

Response: All Figures have uniform presentation.