

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International STD Research & Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_I-SRR_92796
Title of the Manuscript:	A case report of delayed syphilis diagnosis in pregnancy
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:

(<https://www.journali-srr.com/index.php/I-SRR/editorial-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>The manuscript addresses a topic of extreme relevance and great magnitude for global public health and, especially, for maternal and child health, when a late diagnosis can affect maternal health and bring complications to the child, such as congenital syphilis. It is noteworthy that in the case of the report, how important it is to approach and treat the sexual partner(s) to shorten the chain of transmissibility and avoid recurrent cases.</p> <p>However, it should be noted that the study lacked clarity, coherence and literature data that address the issue in a contextualized way, as well as textual organization. Thus, textual reorganization is suggested for replication/dissemination.</p> <p>Thus, the introduction lacked the most up-to-date literature data, international and national studies that justify the same, as well as the justification and relevance of this case report; as for the presentation of the case, there was a lack of clarity, textual organization and detailing of the case addressed; the discussion does not address the authors' critical position, as well as inferences from the case report; and, finally, the conclusion partially responds to the objective of the study.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>TITLE: No suggestions.</p> <p>ABSTRACT: It contemplates the maximum limit of 250 words (162). Therefore, it is suggested to better detail the case by presenting who is this pregnant woman, primiparous? IG? GPA?</p> <p>It is suggested to add: Case Reports, Treponemal Infections</p> <p>Not found descriptors in MeSH: Primary syphilis. Syphilis in pregnancy.</p> <p>INTRODUCTION: It is suggested to the authors greater contextualization of the theme in the world scenario. Also, updated epidemiological data that support the theme on the scene. How big is the problem? What associated factors? What is the justification and relevance of this case report for the scientific community and for maternal and child health?</p> <p>Describe objectively and directly the purpose of the study. Still, let it be similar to the one placed in the summary. Where is Lithuania, describe which region. The authors mention that the cancer has returned. But what kind of soft or hard chancre?</p> <p>OBJECTIVE: no suggestions.</p> <p>CASE PRESENTATION: Is it suggested that the authors describe how this information was obtained? How was the data collected? medical record? Interview? Use of images? Patient consent, anonymity? What is the data collection period? Exemplify the place where the patient is approached, which hospital? Regarding the use of acronyms, mention the meaning of the same in the first use (HIV, IM, CDC) and, later, the use of acronyms.</p> <p>DISCUSSION: It is suggested that the authors link the case report, gestational syphilis, with data from the scientific literature. Thus, what is the critical position of the authors regarding the report and its findings? Critical discussion of the observation made. Is there information as to the details of the sexual partnership(s) if approached, treated? This is of paramount importance, and requires deep discussion and reflection. What are the implications of late diagnosis for maternal and child health? Were there any limitations in the study, if so? Which one?</p> <p>CONCLUSION: Based on the above observations, it is suggested to the authors which reasonable conclusion should be objectively reflected.</p> <p>REFERENCES: It is suggested to review the formatting of the references, as it is not standard according to the norms of the journal.</p>	
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:	Braulio Vieira de Sousa Borges
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Piaui, Brazil