Reviewer's report

Title: Necrotizing fasciitis: Two case reports

Version: 1 Date: 31 March 2014

Reviewer: Vijay Malpathak

Which of the following best describes what type of case report this is?: None

Has the case been reported coherently?: No

Is the case report ethical?: Yes

Is there any missing information that you think must be added before publication?: Yes

Is this case worth reporting?: Yes

Is the case report persuasive?: Yes

Does the case report have explanatory value?: Yes

Does the case report have diagnostic value?: No

Will the case report make a difference to clinical practice?: Yes

Is the anonymity of the patient protected?: Yes

Comments to authors:

Some points in the case history and investigations have not been submitted. Text and grammar will have to be rearranged / corrected.

1) First patient - Only one clinical photo has been provided (at the time of admission). It does not include the leg and foot. (Clinical examination in the text mentions multiple superficial wounds and healed injuries on torso and leg).

2) Clinical examination does not mention whether foot/leg/thigh was swollen and tender /temperature of the limb/any bulla was present/ crepitus present or absent/distal pulsations /cyanosis/skin pallor etc.

3) Second patient - Case discussion in Abstract mentions that she presented after 3 days. In case presentation it is mentioned that she presented after 4 days. This needs correction.

Here again the condition of the lower limb on presentation is not mentioned in
details.
4) Patient 2- Photo of the limb on admission not available for comparison with photo 12 hours after admission.
5) Intra-operative photos of the second patient are not included in the case report.
6) Investigation Reports do not mention hemoglobin (second patient), Sodium, Glucose and C Reactive proteins for calculating the LRINEC score as mentioned in reference number 25.

Quality of written English-minor issues not for publication
Title may be modified as “Necrotizing Fasciitis- A diagnostic dilemma.”

Abstract
Background-
1) Necrotizing……planes of tissues. May be written as Necrotising… various tissue planes.

Case Discussion-
1) Case one…..tertiary care centre. May be modified as -First patient, a 44 years old healthy south Asian man presented at primary health care centre with swollen left lower limb. He was treated with antibiotics with the initial diagnosis was cellulitis. As the patient deteriorated rapidly and additionally developed intestinal obstruction, he was transferred to our hospital which is a tertiary care centre.

2) In case 2…resulted in mortality. May be changed as Second patient was a 35 years old SLE patient receiving immunosuppressive therapy developed left lower limb pain. She came to the hospital after 3 days and her condition deteriorated rapidly, developed septic shock and died within two days.

Please note—he it is mentioned that she presented after 3 days. In case presentation it is mentioned that she presented after 4 days. This needs correction.

Discussion-
1) Case1 had necrotizing fasciitis of the lower limb and psoas from the outset may be changed to First patient had necrotizing fasciitis and muscle necrosis of the adductor compartment of the thigh from the outset.

2) Paragraph 2- Necrotising…..establishing the diagnosis may be changed to Diagnosis of NF is a challenge to a clinician as it is a rare entity and there are no obvious pointers towards the diagnosis.

3) Paragraph 9- The primary focus was shifted to the intestinal obstruction which was due to two possible mechanisms. may be written as The primary focus in the first patient was shifted to the intestinal obstruction which was due to two possible mechanisms.
Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published
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