

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_86464
Title of the Manuscript:	Lymphedema as consequence of Loxosceles Brown Spider Bite: A Case Report and a Literature Review
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:

(<https://www.journalijtdh.com/index.php/IJTDH/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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>This is a very good article as the author has brought out a vivid picture of the patient's experience. Kindly recheck the following:</p> <p>1.Title=Systematic instead of Literature</p> <p>2.TIME Acronym in wound care . E stands for Edge not oedema control</p> <p>3. Revisit a Grammar check throughout the document e.g-caused by or due to../tend to instead of did not ended/estimate of not estimated of/did not improve not did not improved/The case study involved not It is presented a Case study/figure 5 rare case encountered we decided/based on/ ...among others</p> <p>4.Use of the term discarded throughout the document is not clear to the reader- does it mean was ruled out?</p> <p>5.Figure 3 explanation to end at necrotic tissue since the reader will not see bacterial burden from the figure</p>	<p>Thank you very much.</p> <p>1- This is not a systematic review since this absolutely lacks a data statistical methodological or PRISMA analysis. Given this, this can still be considered a literature review.</p> <p>2- Thank you, it has been corrected and expanded this point.</p> <p>3- Thank you, it has been corrected.</p> <p>4- Yes, it has been rephrased</p> <p>5- Solved</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>1. Case presentation part in the Abstract can be more brief since it is detailed in the body of the article.</p> <p>2. Examination may be used instead of exploration of the left leg and debridement may be used instead of eliminating.</p> <p>3. Revisit the article indicating 'Patient fled'..does it indicate lost to follow-up or absconding from the health facility.</p>	<p>1.</p> <p>2. Thank you, it has been shortened</p> <p>3. Corrected</p> <p>4. Corrected</p>
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>Thank you for highlighting a case successfully managed after a Loxosceles Brown Spider bite that is enriched by a systematic review of the same.</p> <p>Kindly check if this article's Case 6 can shed more light Gitterle, M. (2020). Treatment with novel HYBENX® root canal cleanser suggests biofilms blocked healing of human wounds: case series. <i>M. Pasini, S. Caruso, L. Lardani, R. Gatto, MR Giuca and M. Severino. Frenula in the oral cavity: an overview of diagnosis, 34</i>(1 Supplement 1), 1.</p> <p>May also check out page 919 of the following book-Wound Care Essentials:Practice Principles 2016 4th Edition by Sharon Baranoski and Elizabeth Ayello by Wolters Kluwer</p>	<p>Thank you very much for your kind review and suggestions</p>

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	