

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Pediatric Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPR_87537
Title of the Manuscript:	Lobster Claw hand deformity - Cornelia de Lange syndrome
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.journalajpr.com/index.php/AJPR/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 authors report two cases CdL syndrome as teaching cases. However, a clinical description of two cases is not enough to serve as didactic report, and especially not for genetic counselling of the family.</p> <p>In 2018 an international consensus statement was published, providing clinical scores helping to distinguish between classical and non-classical CdLS. Such a distinction is necessary to diagnose and treat a child with suggesting features CdLS and especially, to provide genetic council to a family. As at least five genes are known to be involved in this disorder of transcriptional regulation. The pathogenetic variant in Nipped-B-like protein accounts for about 60% of patients with CdLS, called CdLS type 1 in OMIM database. This database provides nice photos of all features associated with CdLS. So to be of teaching value, this report should discuss the evaluation of these newborn children by the clinical score. Furthermore, the authors should discuss the reason not to confirm the diagnosis by a genetic test. Lastly, the risks of the family to have another child with CdLS or another cohesinopathy should be discussed.</p> <p>Minor comments Cases 1 and 2: Please indicate the exact gestational age at birth, percentile or the standard deviation of the head circumference for age, and the percentiles or standard deviations of body weight and length for age of both infants.</p>	<p>Dear sir/madam,</p> <p>Thank you for your valuable feedback on our article. We have edited our manuscript to include further clinical description regarding gestational age and anthropometric percentiles for both neonates. We have also added the clinical criterion as suggested by the international consensus statement on CdLS applied to both our neonates, with both neonates fitting into the classical variety. We have added a section on molecular genetics of CdLS and importance of genetic counselling in these neonates. We were unable to perform genetic sequencing due to parental financial constraints and is a limitation of our article.</p> <p>We do hope our articles meets the revisions expected and are happy to meet any further revisions mandated.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
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>	