

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCRS_124994
Title of the Manuscript:	Pediculosis of the eyelids: a case report
Type of the Article	Case report

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: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <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>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The manuscript "Pediculosis of the Eyelids: A Case Report" highlights a rare but clinically significant condition, offering valuable insights into its etiology, diagnosis, and treatment. By addressing the diagnostic challenges and treatment strategies, it serves as an educational resource for healthcare professionals, particularly ophthalmologists and dermatologists. Additionally, it emphasizes the importance of awareness and hygiene in managing and preventing such infestations, especially in children, contributing to better patient outcomes.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The current title, "Pediculosis of the Eyelids: A Case Report" is clear and informative, but it could be more engaging or specific to draw interest from a wider audience. "Eyelid Lice Infestation: A Case Report and Review".</p> <p>Another title for the manuscript would be: "Eyelid Lice Infestation: A Case Report and Review"</p> <p>This title is concise, engaging, and indicates both the specific condition (eyelid lice infestation) and the manuscript's scope (case report and review), making it appealing to both clinicians and researchers.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract provides a concise overview of the condition, discussing its rarity, symptoms, and management. However, it could be made more comprehensive by including specific details from the case report and emphasizing its significance for clinical practice. Here are some suggestions:</p> <p>Additions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highlight key details from the case, such as the age of the patient, the clinical presentation, and the outcome of treatment. This would give the abstract more context and make it more informative. • Mention the diagnostic challenges or potential complications to underline why the topic is relevant for clinicians. • Briefly mention the successful resolution of the condition with specific treatments. <p>Deletions:</p> <p>No major deletions are necessary, but the abstract should avoid generic statements if space is a concern. For instance, "Although often overlooked, this condition can lead to bothersome symptoms and complications" could be rephrased or omitted if details about the case are added.</p>	
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>The manuscript appears scientifically correct based on the provided content. It accurately describes the etiology, clinical presentation, diagnostic methods, and treatment of eyelid pediculosis. The case report is detailed and follows a logical progression, aligning with standard practices for diagnosing and managing such infestations. Additionally, the inclusion of relevant references supports its scientific credibility.</p> <p>Recommendation:</p> <p>Consider adding a brief mention of differential diagnoses or alternative management strategies to provide a more comprehensive perspective.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The manuscript includes references that appear relevant and credible, but their sufficiency and recency could be improved. Most cited references are recent (2021–2023), which is a positive aspect, but the total number of references is limited. For a case report combined with a review, more references would strengthen its depth and credibility. Additionally, including references focused on the management of eyelid-specific pediculosis and rare ocular infestations could enhance the manuscript's scholarly value.</p> <p>Suggestions for Additional References:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference to a detailed review of ocular infestations or pediculosis-related complications. • References to established guidelines for treating eyelid lice infestations. • Including case studies or reports from PubMed, Scopus, or Web of Science that detail unique challenges or outcomes in treating eyelid pediculosis. • Studies or reviews focusing on the role of hygiene in preventing lice infestations in community settings. <p>Example Additional References:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Chosidow, O. (2000). Scabies and pediculosis. <i>The Lancet</i>, 355(9206), 819-826. [DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(99)09458-1] 2. Burgess, I. F. (2009). Current treatments for pediculosis capitis. <i>Current Opinion in Infectious Diseases</i>, 22(2), 131- 	

Review Form 3

	136. [DOI: 10.1097/QCO.0b013e328324bc8c]	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<p>The language and English quality of the manuscript are generally suitable for scholarly communication, but some areas could benefit from refinement to enhance clarity, flow, and academic tone. Here's suggestions for improvement:</p> <p>Abstract: The abstract is clear but could benefit from concise and precise phrasing to make it more impactful.</p> <p>For example, replace: <i>"Although often overlooked, this condition can lead to bothersome symptoms and complications"</i> With: <i>"This underrecognized condition may cause significant symptoms and complications if untreated."</i></p> <p>Grammar and Word Choice:</p> <p>Replace: <i>"We treated the patient with a 5% permethrin lotion for 3 weeks for his scalp, with shaving of the eyelashes..."</i> With: <i>"The patient was treated with a 5% permethrin lotion for 3 weeks for the scalp, along with eyelash shaving..."</i></p> <p>Use more formal language: Instead of <i>"Her scalp symptoms resolved,"</i> consider <i>"The scalp symptoms resolved."</i></p> <p>Academic Tone: Certain sentences are conversational and could be revised for a more formal scholarly tone.</p> <p>Replace: <i>"No family member had suffered from pediculosis..."</i> With: <i>"No family members reported symptoms of pediculosis."</i></p> <p>Consistency: Ensure consistent use of terms such as "eyelid pediculosis" vs. "pediculosis of the eyelids." Using one consistently improves readability.</p> <p>Avoid Redundancy: For example, avoid repeating the same diagnostic or treatment methods across multiple sections unless necessary.</p> <p>Recommendation:</p> <p>The language quality is adequate for scholarly communication, but minor editing and proofreading will improve its professionalism and readability. Engaging a professional language editor or using grammar tools like Grammarly or an academic editing service would ensure the manuscript meets high scholarly standards.</p>	
Optional/General comments	Based on the provided content and available information, there is no immediate evidence of plagiarism in the manuscript.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ruby Kumar
Department, University & Country	Govt. Ayurveda College, Patna, India