

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCRS_77416
Title of the Manuscript:	Paediatric Primary Peritonitis: A rare entity among immunocompetent individuals rearing its head again during this COVID-19 pandemic era.
Type of the Article	Case report

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>From the abstract part</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reference is not recommended. 2. The abstract should have the following points <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Burden of Paediatric Primary Peritonitis and major findings • The impact of lockdown towards paediatric peritonitis • Conclusion and suggestions • Optional Keywords 3. Questions need to be addressed <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How do you assure the stage is to be "primary peritonitis"? 2. What is the clinical significance of this case study? 3. As you said, the case is more common in the paediatric age group, so why did you come up with this case study? What makes it strange or unusual? 4. How do you correlate the increment of WBC count towards a cultured negative result? 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Your paper requires English language (grammar) copy-editing. 2. The coherence of the idea should be revised again. 3. Paragraph development should be revised again (one paragraph should be better to have only one major objective). 4. From the case discussion part, at paragraph three: You said <i>Streptococcus Pneumoniae</i> is the causative agent in the majority of peritonitis cases, which is strange to me, but it can be the most common causative agent for pleural cavity infection. 5. Whenever you write bacteria at species level, you have to make it italic (e.g., <i>Streptococcus Pneumoniae</i>). 6. Table 2: Where did you get this bacterial profile and frequency since the peritoneal fluid was cultured negative? 7. How can we approve that the figures are the authors' own? 8. In the discussion, it would help if the authors instead discussed the pathogenesis and its clinical impact and how the incidence of peritonitis can be affected during the lockdown period. 9. So, what is your recommendation to prevent the effect of lockdown following the emergence of COVID-19 and how can the problem be overcome? 	
Optional/General comments	<p>It should be re-written again with scientific flow and should address the following points again</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What makes the case for being new? 2. What was the surprising finding? 3. What can you say about primary peritonitis and what were the criteria for saying so? 4. What was the preliminary cause of the case to be associated with the impact of lockdown? 5. What was the evidence to say the case was emerging because of the effect of COVID-19 lockdown? 	

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Dagninet Alelign Emiru</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Arba Minch University, Ethiopia</i>