



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Pediatric Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPR_64864
Title of the Manuscript:	Orbital cellulitis in children: experience of the pediatric service at mohammed v military hospital
Type of the Article	Case study

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://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy>)



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The abstract is clear and concise, well understandable, but lacks two fundamental information: it does not explain what is the objective of the work, nor what is the methodology used, it only focuses on the results, showing what was obtained.</p> <p>Moreover, although results are well outlined and schematically explained, they also lack, however, an important information, namely the total number of patients on which the Authors worked.</p> <p>The introduction, like the abstract is very concise. Unlike the first part, it explains better what is the Authors' intent and the aim of the work, but it is still not exhaustive.</p> <p>I would suggest to introduce some more information about the topic, underlining better how the incidence of the pathology is distributed, which is the sex or the age most affected. It would also be interesting to understand what are the clinical implications of this pathology and why it is useful to study it in a more in-depth way.</p> <p>The Material and methods section is virtually nonexistent. Authors do not explain much of what happened during the study, nor do they specify more purely technical/legal notes such as the consent obtained from the patients. These are purely technical notes, but they are essential in order to make the work accessible and reproducible by anyone interested in doing it or in understanding how it was possible to set up the project.</p> <p>The Material and methods section also does not explain what parameters are considered during the study.</p> <p>The Results section is an exact copy of the Abstract. Certainly synthetic: it does not run the risk of being boring, but in doing so it does not even explain what was actually obtained by the Authors.</p> <p>The clinical value of the results obtained is not explained and there is no reference to the tables that are then inserted.</p> <p>Missing points, so far described, are partly covered in the discussion: what has been included in the discussion should therefore be reported in the correct paragraphs, deepening, however, in each case, the most important concepts.</p> <p>The manuscript, at present, is difficult to understand and seems to lack a common thread. There is not a real conclusion to the work that need a complete and deep revision. Moreover, the bibliography supporting the study is not sufficient.</p> <p>In the end, it could be useful, in order to support the results obtained and the conclusion – to be defined – to add also some images, from a diagnostic TC, for example, if it is possible, at least to better explain and show the differences between two types of orbital cellulitis that could occur.</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	Overall, the article is well written and the English is scientifically appropriate. There are alterations in formatting in some places (lines not fully written, missing points) that should be revised.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Rita Rezzani
Department, University & Country	University of Brescia, Italy