

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-53257

Date:13-08-2025

Title: A Deadly Threat of Staphylococcus: A Rare Case of Staphylococcal Skin Scalded Syndrome with Toxic Shock Syndrome

Recommendation:

Accept as it is

Accept after minor revision.....✓.....

Accept after major revision

Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality		✓		
Clarity			✓	
Significance		✓		

Reviewer Name: Shashi Prakash

Date: 13-08-2025

Reviewer's Comment for Publication.

(To be published with the manuscript in the journal)

The reviewer is requested to provide a brief comment (3-4 lines) highlighting the significance, strengths, or key insights of the manuscript. This comment will be Displayed in the journal publication alongside with the reviewers name.

This article presents a highly unusual case of simultaneous Staphylococcal Scalded Skin Syndrome (SSSS) and Toxic Shock Syndrome (TSS) in a child, noting the diagnostic difficulty and life-saving effect of early empirical treatment. It provides useful clinical information to sparse literature on dual toxin-mediated diseases due to *S. aureus*. The discussion is good but could be clearer with better organization and conciseness.

Detailed Reviewer's Report

1. The abstract is an effective summary of the case, underlying pathology, and outcome of treatment. It is, however, packed and would be improved by re-framing as background, case report, and conclusion for convenient reading. The inclusion of a concise statement of novelty (third reported worldwide) at the beginning would enhance its value. Do not repeat treatment information already presented in the body.
2. The introduction adequately describes SSSS and TSS with relevant references but could be more concise. The rationale for presenting this

REVIEWER'S REPORT

specific case (its rarity and diagnostic complexity) should be emphasized earlier to engage readers. Including a sentence on the clinical importance of differentiating from SJS/TEN would strengthen the context.

3. The clinical progression is well documented and described, but could be organized in chronological fashion with sub-headings (symptoms, examination, investigations, management, outcome) to make it easier to read. A concise table of vitals and important labs would be beneficial. Minor grammatical corrections must be made for better flow.
4. The discussion is good and reveals a good literature review but is unnecessarily lengthy and occasionally redundant. Important mechanisms (action of toxin, differential diagnosis) are well described, but the pathophysiologic points can be summarized. Consider emphasizing how this case is different from those in the two earlier reports and clearly discussing its clinical implications (early suspicion, empiric therapy).
5. The conclusion is properly stressing early treatment and diagnosis but should be more concise. Restate the extremity of concurrent SSSS and TSS and conclude the essential clinical takeaway in two to three succinct sentences instead of recounting discussion material.