Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics
Volume 16 · Issue 3 · e160773

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Cutaneous Manifestations in Children with Celiac Disease

Mahsa Besharat, Mehrdad Teimoorian, Mohammad Sobhani Shahmirzadi, Ali Ghezelsefloo, Alireza Niazi, Amineh Kashiri, Khatereh Shahidi, Seyed Amirali Hoseini, Mohammad Dadjou

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
25 Feb 2025	26 May 2025	10 Jun 2025	10.5812/jcp-160773

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 **Original submission** Referee 1, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 2
2 **Revision 1** Referee 1, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 6
3 **Revision 2** Referee 1, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 7
Authors' reply to reviewers 8
Reviewer and editor comments 10
4 **Revision 3** Referee 1, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 13
Authors' reply to reviewers 14
Reviewer and editor comments 17

1 Original submission

3 comments · 10 Mar 2025 – 7 May 2025

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 10 Mar 2025

Thanks for the invitation.
1. Did the clinician refer all celiac cases to a dermatologist, or were patients with skin lesions examined by a dermatologist?
2. How much time elapsed between GFD and the dermatological evaluation?
3. Were they examined by one dermatologist, or were they examined by different dermatologists?

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 7 May 2025

Dear EIC,
Thanks to the authors and appreciation to the researchers. The manuscript presents valuable research. But some revisions are needed. The authors should revise it based on the comments. Also, a minor change should be made in the abstract:
A summary of the statistical analysis results should be included in the results section.

Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 7 May 2025

Dear Author,
Thank you for submitting the article. It needs some revision. Please revise it based on the reviewers' and AE's comments.

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Dear Editor;

Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics

Thank you for your kind comments regards our manuscript: “Cutaneous Manifestations in Children with Celiac Diseases”. Here are answers to the reviewers’ comments, also corrections are highlighted in the main text.

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:
Thanks for invitation.
1. Did the clinician refer all celiac cases to a dermatologist or patients with skin lesion were examined by a dermatologist?

Answer: All invited participants were examined by one dermatologist attending to the research center as scheduled.

2. How long has passed from GFD and dermatological evaluation?

Answer: As mentioned in the methods, the mean (SD) duration of disease was 4.24 (2.64) years. It has been added that starting of the GFD was at the same time of diagnosis.

3. Did they visited by one dermatologist or different dermatologists visited them?

Answer: All visits are done by one dermatologist, for the first time and in the research center where participants were invited to come.

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:
Dear EIC,
Thanks to the authors and appreciation to the researchers. The manuscript is a valuable research. But some revisions are needed. Authors should revise it based on comments. Also minor change should be done in abstract:
Summary of Statistical analysis results should be mention in result section.

Answer: A paragraph about statistical analysis was added to the result section.

Major Comments:

The abstract does not discuss potential sources of bias or efforts to address them.

Answer: This was a cross-sectional study that was done as a census.

There is no mention of the rationale for the sample size.

Answer: As mentioned in the method section, all registered cases were invited to participate in this study and 39 were consented to come for visit.

The abstract lacks a discussion on the generalisability of the results.

Answer: As we have a small sample size, our results could not be generalized to otherpopulations.

Minor Comments:

Specific dates for recruitment and data collection are not provided.

Answer: Date of recruitment was between April and July 2023, this has been added to the method section.

The method of participant selection is not detailed beyond the registry center.

Answer: This was a census so there was no selection. All registered cases were invited through telephone call and those who consented to come for visit had been recruited in the study.

2 Revision 1

3 comments · 15 May 2025 – 15 May 2025

Referee 1 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 15 May 2025

Thanks for your great invitation.
As mentioned before, the case selection is not clear! If your cases are on GFD, how did you consider their skin lesions to be CD sequelae?
It was logical to consider a control group in this study.

Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 15 May 2025

Dear EIC,
The manuscript still needs revision.

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 15 May 2025

Dear Author,
Your manuscript still needs some revision. Please revise it based on the reviewers' and AE's comments.

3

Revision 2

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Dear editor

Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics

Manuscript ID: 160773

Manuscript Title: Cutaneous Manifestations in Children with Celiac Diseases

Thank you for your kind and helpful comments. Here are answers to the comments and highlighted in the text.

Answers to the Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:
Thanks for your great invitation.
As mentioned before, the case selection in not clear! If your cases are on GFD, how did you consider their skin lesions as CD sequela?
It was logical to consider a control group in this study.

Answer:

As mentioned in the materials and methods, there were 79 registered cases of celiac disease in our research center registry and we called all to invite them for visits. Among them, 39 children/parents were consented for visit.

About the second part of the comments, in these cases GFD had been suggested at the time of diagnosis but the adherence to GFD was fair to poor in children and most of them were at the 2 first years of the diagnosis. So, the skin lesions were attributed to the celiac disease.

About your comment about considering a control group, as the purpose of this study was describing the skin lesions related to the gluten exposure, a control group would not be necessary in this setting.

Major Comments:

- The abstract does not discuss the limitations of the study, which is crucial for understanding potential biases and the reliability of the findings.
- There is no mention of the generalizability of the study results, which is important for understanding the applicability of the findings to other populations.

Answer:

In conclusion part of the abstract, it was added that “although further study with larger sample size would be suggested.”, to show the limited sample size of the study and the limitation for generalizability of our findings.

Minor Comments:

- The abstract does not mention the source of funding, which could provide insight into potential conflicts of interest.

Answer:

There was no instruction in the journal guideline for mentioning the funding source in abstract. The funding source is mentioned after the conclusion and before references.

3 Revision 2

3 comments · 23 May 2025 – 24 May 2025

Referee 1 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 23 May 2025

Here is a critical review of the revised manuscript titled "Cutaneous Manifestations in Children with Celiac Diseases", incorporating the authors' responses to reviewer comments:

Overall Assessment

The manuscript addresses an important, underexplored topic: dermatologic presentations of celiac disease (CD) in children. The research is of clinical value, particularly in settings where CD diagnosis is often delayed or under-recognized. The authors responded reasonably to reviewer concerns, but some issues remain that should be addressed to improve scientific rigor and clarity.

Strengths

The study focuses on a specific, well-defined population (children with CD under age 18).

Skin examination by a dermatologist enhances diagnostic accuracy.

The study presents a wide spectrum of cutaneous manifestations.

Ethical approval and informed consent were obtained and clearly documented.

Major Comments

1. Case Selection & GFD Adherence

Issue: As noted by Reviewer 1, the inclusion of children with poor adherence to GFD weakens the direct attribution of skin findings to untreated CD.

Authors' Response: They clarify that most children were early in their disease and had poor GFD adherence; hence, the manifestations were still likely CD-related.

Comment: This rationale is acceptable, but the authors should clearly define and quantify adherence levels (e.g., using a validated adherence scale) to better support their assumption.

2. Control Group

Issue: The absence of a control group limits the interpretation of prevalence rates and specificity of cutaneous findings to CD.

Authors' Justification: They aimed to describe the spectrum, not compare prevalence.

Comment: This should be explicitly acknowledged as a limitation in both the abstract and discussion.

3. Statistical Reporting

Issue: Mean age reported as “4.416 (9.85)” is mathematically inconsistent (SD exceeds the mean).

Comment: Recheck the raw data and revise—the numbers suggest a potential reporting error.

4. Abstract Limitations Section

Comment: While the sample size limitation is now mentioned, the lack of a control group, limited generalizability, and unmeasured confounders (like GFD adherence) should also be briefly included.

5. Generalizability

Comment: While the authors added a line about sample size, they should also mention that results may not apply to other populations (e.g., different ethnicities or higher GFD adherence contexts).

Minor Comments

1. Language & Grammar

Examples:

“Skin manifestations represent significant non-digestive symptoms…” could be rephrased as “Skin manifestations are significant extra-intestinal symptoms…”

“patients were attended for visit” should be revised to “patients attended the clinic for evaluation.”

2. Funding Statement

Placement is acceptable per the journal’s guidelines, but reiterating “no additional funding sources” improves transparency.

3. Ethical Approval

Comprehensive and well-documented.

4. Reference Formatting

Consistent and appropriate. Ensure that all references cited in-text match the reference list.

5. Tables

Well-organized, but Table 2 might benefit from subheadings (e.g., Duration, Distribution, Location, Type) for easier reading.

Recommendations

To strengthen the manuscript:

Recalculate or confirm the descriptive statistics (especially age and disease duration).

Clearly state the limitations regarding the lack of a control group and reliance on assumed GFD adherence.

Improve clarity and grammar throughout for better readability.

Consider renaming the study to more clearly reflect its descriptive (rather than comparative) design.

Associate Editor MINOR REVISION 24 May 2025

Dear Editor-in-Chief,

I would like to extend my gratitude to the authors for their contribution and commend the researchers for their valuable work presented in the manuscript. However, I believe that certain revisions are necessary, and I

kindly request the authors to consider incorporating these suggested changes based on the provided comments.

Editor-in-Chief MINOR REVISION 24 May 2025

Dear Author,
Your manuscript still needs some revision. Please revise it based on the reviewers' and AE's comments.

4

Revision 3

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Dear Editor of Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics

Here are the answers to the last comments and the corrections are highlighted in the main text.

Reviewers' Comments:

Major Comments

1. Case Selection & GFD Adherence

Issue: As noted by Reviewer 1, the inclusion of children with poor adherence to GFD weakens the direct attribution of skin findings to untreated CD.

Authors' Response: They clarify that most children were early in their disease and had poor GFD adherence, hence the manifestations were still likely CD-related.

Comment: This rationale is acceptable, but the authors should clearly define and quantify adherence levels (e.g., using a validated adherence scale) to better support their assumption.

Answer:

As mentioned in the manuscript, most children were at early stages of their diagnosis. So, we had an expert interview with them and their family and it showed a low level of awareness in parents and the effect on the GFD adherence. But we did not use any validated scale.

2. Control Group

Issue: The absence of a control group limits the interpretation of prevalence rates and specificity of cutaneous findings to CD.

Authors' Justification: They aimed to describe the spectrum, not compare prevalence.

Comment: This should be explicitly acknowledged as a limitation in both the abstract and discussion.

Answer:

This issue has been added as a limitation in abstract and discussion.

3. Statistical Reporting

Issue: Mean age reported as “4.416 (9.85)” is mathematically inconsistent (SD exceeds the mean).

Comment: Recheck the raw data and revise—the numbers suggest a potential reporting error.

Answer:

The correct mean (SD) is 9.84 (4.41), as shown in the table. It has been corrected in the main text and abstract.

4. Abstract Limitations Section

Comment: While the sample size limitation is now mentioned, the lack of control group, limited generalizability, and unmeasured confounders (like GFD adherence) should also be briefly included.

Answer:

Abstract has been corrected as requested.

5. Generalizability

Comment: While the authors added a line about sample size, they should also mention that results may not apply to other populations (e.g., different ethnicities or higher GFD adherence contexts).

Answer:

This issue has been mentioned in the conclusion section.

Minor Comments

1. Language & Grammar

Examples:

“Skin manifestations represent significant non-digestive symptoms…” could be rephrased as “Skin manifestations are significant extra-intestinal symptoms...”

“patients were attended for visit” should be revised to “patients attended the clinic for evaluation.”

Answer:

We tried to rephrase sentences like this to improve the grammar and language.

2. Funding Statement

Placement is acceptable per the journal’s guidelines, but reiterating “no additional funding sources” improves transparency.

Answer:

This sentence has been added.

3. Ethical Approval

Comprehensive and well-documented.

4. Reference Formatting

Consistent and appropriate. Ensure that all references cited in-text match the reference list.

Answer:

All references have been checked.

5. Tables

Well-organized but Table 2 might benefit from subheadings (e.g., Duration, Distribution, Location, Type) for easier reading.

Answer:

The subheading has been justified in the table topic.

4 Revision 3

3 comments · 9 Jun 2025 – 10 Jun 2025

Referee 1 Reviewer

ACCEPT 9 Jun 2025

Thanks for your invitation.
The authors' answers to the reviewers' comments are convincing.

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 10 Jun 2025

Dear EIC.
Previous errors have been corrected, and there are no further recommendations.

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 10 Jun 2025

Dear Author
Thank you for paying attention and responding to the reviewer’s comments.