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A novel observation of Pubic Osteomyelitis due to Streptococcus Viridans after dental extraction; a case report.

By Naqvi, Naseem; Wong, Christopher; Naqvi, Rizwana; Pearce, Sushmita.

Reviewer's Comments:

1. This is a 2½-page descriptive case report of a young adult man who developed unilateral pubic ramus osteomyelitis two weeks following a dental extraction. The article presents the case and clinical course of the described patient. The discussion reviews the predominance of cases having been reported in athletes, as well as a brief denouement about Streptococcus viridans's contribution to infective endocarditis. This is a novel case report of the pathogen's association with pubic osteomyelitis. Seven references span 1975-2002.

2. The quality of the writing in this article is substantially substandard and unacceptable for publication. Medical jargon prevails throughout the report, with misspelling, repetition, and syntax errors riddling the article. In short, it is nearly unreadable. Capitalized words frequently appear in the middle of sentences for common nouns and adverbs. Examples:
   a. the plantars were flexors.
   b. He was empirically commenced on...
c. â##swinging pyrexiaâ##

d. â##â#| painful restriction of hip movementsâ## â## is this arthritis (hip tenderness and limitation of motion)?

e. â##â#| it is often wrongly diagnosedâ##|â## (the appropriate term is â##misdiagnosedâ##)

f. â##â#| with intact cranial nerves, No cerebellar signs or ataxias.â## [sic]


4. This article fails to address specific issues about pubic osteomyelitis in athletes, including:

a. Pre-existing subclinical osteitis pubis may make athletes locally susceptible to pubic osteomyelitis

b. An athleteâ##s immune system may be compromised during strenuous exercise, perhaps increasing his/her susceptibility to transient bacteremia.

5. The case report does not detail any investigation into potential immunodeficiency in the described patient, which may have predisposed to this uncommon osseous infection.

6. Introduction: â##Pubic osteomyelitis is a very rare osteomyelitis of bone.â##
The reference provided is from 1975. Recent references (e.g., Meirovitz) cite that 2% of osteomyelitis is pubic in location. â##Very rareâ## overstates current knowledge about anatomic distribution of disease. The introduction would be strengthened by detailing the common pathogens in the known risk groups: a) athletes, b) diabetics, c) IV drug abusers, and d) patients who have had genitourinary surgery.

7. The Discussion would be improved by including information about osteitis pubis, the main differential diagnostic consideration and a potentially predisposing condition, especially in athletes. Further, readers will benefit from a brief review of appropriate evaluation and management of suspected pubic osteomyelitis.

8. The authors need to eliminate the repetition in the first paragraph of the Discussion section about â##painful restriction of hip movementsâ##, which begs the question of whether the patient presented with an acute hip arthritis. Cardinal features of arthritis include effusion, and/or the presence of 2 of these 3 features: erythema/heat, tenderness and limitation of movement. The authorâ##s description is compatible with arthritis, yet this is not clarified.

9. Laboratory values should be cited in the International System of Units (SI) style, the standard for scientific articles.
What next?: Revise and resubmit

Quality of written English: Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited