

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJRID_122884</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Caught by a Medieval Disease: A Monoarthritis Revealing Syphilis - A Case Report.</b>
Type of the Article	

#### **General guidelines for the Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p>This is an interesting case report about syphilis, the great imitator. Congratulations to the authors for the efforts. The patient presented with monoarthritis of the left knee, history of oral ulceration and constitutional manifestations, along with positive syphilis serology (VDRL-TPHA), in addition to confirmation of the diagnosis using synovial fluid aspiration and analysis for treponema pallidum. Then he was treated with IM penicillin G weekly for 3 weeks with good response.</p> <p>The authors have investigated their case meticulously and have approached the diagnosis after an appropriate and scientifically sound work up for exclusion of other infectious aetiologies and differentials. However, there are major deficiencies in the structure of the case report, particularly writing of the abstract and conclusion section.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>I believe the title is suitable and attractive to the readers.</p>	
<p><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b></p>	<p>The abstract is not comprehensive at all. The abstract better to be following this outline, even if it will be non-structured according to the journal's guidelines: the objective/aim of the work, case presentation, and finally the conclusion and keywords</p> <p>1- The objective/aim of the work section: It can be more concise and informative. No need to discuss the geographical and natural history of syphilis. It is better to focus on the broad-spectrum manifestations of syphilis, this great mimicking disease including rheumatological, in addition to the importance of timely diagnosis and management to prevent morbidity.</p> <p>2- Where is the case presentation section?! The authors need to address in the abstract what was done to the patient in order to approach the diagnosis after exclusion of diseases with overlapping features and other infections, in addition to the management and response to treatment. N.B The abstract should stand alone as the manuscript itself.</p> <p>3- Add a conclusion section, reflecting the results of the case report (the findings) then discuss what they convey.</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>1- Introduction It seems appropriate. However, the authors have focused only on the natural history and geography of the disease several times in the introduction and conclusion section. A small paragraph discussing the rheumatological manifestations of syphilis would be comprehensive (as the current case presented with monoarthritis). Add literature reviews about these manifestations in the different stages of syphilis (secondary and tertiary). Is arthritis common with secondary and tertiary syphilis? Incidence? This will pave the way for the discussion part (whether the authors would attribute this case presentation to secondary or tertiary stage?</p> <p>2- Case Report It is very nicely written. The authors discussed the case from multiple angles without overinterpretation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In the third paragraph of the case report, the authors have excluded other differentials of rheumatic diseases that could present with mono or oligo arthritis as sarcoidosis and Behcet's disease. However, they did not mention if the patient had any manifestations of spondyloarthropathies as psoriasis, inflammatory back pain, inflammatory bowel disease</li> </ul>	

**Review Form 3**

	<p>(IBD) and positive family history of IBD or psoriasis.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The authors should mention when the arthritis and associated manifestations resolved (the exact response to treatment).</li> </ul> <p>3- I believe it is mandatory to add a discussion section before the conclusion, focusing in brief on the natural history of syphilis disease and discussing the case diagnosis and management. Also, adding a paragraph about the rheumatological manifestations of syphilis would be more comprehensive, including the incidence and pattern of arthritis throughout the whole stages of syphilis.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A compelling argument arises, whether the patient was considered to be in the secondary or tertiary syphilis stage. I believe that the rapid resolution of arthritis and the presence of constitutional manifestations suggests that it could be attributed to secondary syphilis.</li> </ul> <p>4- In the conclusion, the authors better to omit the paragraph about syphilis natural history. Instead, consider adding a paragraph reflecting the findings of the case report and they need to focus on the message to be conveyed and the contribution of the case report to the current clinical practice.</p>	
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p>I think the manuscript is scientifically and technically sound as the authors have approached the diagnosis after extensive workup including history, examination and investigations for rheumatological diseases and panel of investigations for other infections.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p>The authors need to check the references. Only Ref 1 &amp;2 are present in the text of the manuscript.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes, I believe so.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Passant Nabil El-Husseiny</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Cairo University, Egypt</b>