

Answering the reviewers

Reviewer #1

Scientific quality : Good

Novelty of this manuscript : Good

Creativity or innovation of this manuscript : Good

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript : Good

Language quality : A great deal

The article provides a comprehensive overview of the history and epidemiology of mpox, focusing specifically on its clinical features and management in pediatric patients. The increasing number of mpox cases, particularly among children and adolescents, underscores the importance of ongoing surveillance and awareness among healthcare professionals. The age distribution of cases suggests that different age groups may have distinct modes of transmission, with close household contact playing a significant role in younger children and sexual contact in adolescents. This information can inform prevention strategies and targeted interventions. It is crucial to prioritize the recognition of mpox-like rashes, even in the absence of travel history, to facilitate early diagnosis and appropriate management. Further research is needed to gain a better understanding of the factors contributing to mpox spread in different populations and to develop effective prevention and control measures. 1. The manuscript lacks key information such as a title. 2. It is recommended to supplement the content with updates on the development and research progress of monkeypox virus vaccines, making the review more comprehensive. 3. It is suggested to add a table to showcase treatment strategies and methods for monkeypox virus, such as which treatment strategies are suitable for specific clinical symptoms, in order to provide more references for clinical practice. 4. The article needs to provide prospects and predictions for future research directions and potential studies on monkeypox virus infection to enhance the research significance. 5. It is recommended to supplement the clinical characteristics of monkeypox virus infection with a table, which will greatly improve the quality of the article.

Dear reviewer, thank you very much for your questions.

1.The manuscript lacks key information such as a title.

The new title is added.

2.It is recommended to supplement the content with updates on the development and research progress of monkeypox virus vaccines, making the review more comprehensive.

Information is added.

3.It is suggested to add a table to showcase treatment strategies and methods for monkeypox virus, such as which treatment strategies are suitable for

specific clinical symptoms, in order to provide more references for clinical practice.

Table 1 added at the end of the article.

4. The article needs to provide prospects and predictions for future research directions and potential studies on monkeypox virus infection to enhance the research significance.

The information is added.

5. It is recommended to supplement the clinical characteristics of monkeypox virus infection with a table, which will greatly improve the quality of the article.

Table is added at the end of the article.

Reviewer # 2

Scientific quality : Fair

Novelty of this manuscript :: No novelty

Creativity or innovation of this manuscript : No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript : Fair

Language quality : A great deal of language polishing

Conclusion : Major revision

Re-review : No

Peer-reviewer statements : Peer-Review: Anonymous

Conflicts-of-Interest: No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The title and the content don't go together. The Abstract makes it seem the paper is about MPox in USA. The paper is not well written in terms of grammar too.

Dear reviewer, thank you very much for your questions.

The title is changed to match with the content. Abstract includes the summary of all discussions included in the paper. Proofreading is done to correct the mistakes of grammar.