

## Review report

Final title: **Clinical and biochemical profile of wasp sting patients in a tertiary care hospital**

Title at submission: **Clinical and biochemical profile of wasp sting patients in a tertiary care hospital**



OPEN ACCESS

## ROUND 1

**Reviewer:** Hazim Abdul Rahman Alhiti, 0000-0003-0000-8267

### Overview

The topic is worth of researching. There are many papers in google scholar and Refseek about this topic.

#### 1. Comment Appropriateness of the Title

The title is appropriate. However, the short title is missing.

#### Response

The short title is provided.

#### 2. Comment Clarity of the rationale for conducting the study is given in the Introduction section

Please use following link to revise the introduction, expand the discussion, and update some references.

[https://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=ar&as\\_sdt=0%2C5&q=Clinical+and+biochemical+profile+of+wasp+sting+patients+in+a+tertiary+care+hospital+in+Bangladesh&btnG=](https://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=ar&as_sdt=0%2C5&q=Clinical+and+biochemical+profile+of+wasp+sting+patients+in+a+tertiary+care+hospital+in+Bangladesh&btnG=)

#### Response

We have updated the introduction with major edits.

#### 3. Comment The Methods are described in sufficient details so that the study can be reproduced. Whether ethical concerns have been well described

- Purposive (non-random) sampling: This introduces selection bias.
- Comparing wasp-stung patients to non-stung individuals (or those stung by other insects) could strengthen causal inferences about symptoms/complications.
- The study cannot establish causality or long-term outcomes of wasp stings.
- Factors like pre-existing allergies, sting location, or delayed hospital arrival could influence outcomes but may not be adequately controlled for.

#### Response

- It will be a consecutive sampling technique as we have included all available participants who met the criteria until the desired sample size was reached. The following changes have been made ( Lines 122-124).
- It could improve the paper. However, we did not plan for a case-control study rather this report series of cases.
- The current design is not to establish a casual relationship.
- There was no history of allergies in the affected patient.

#### 4. Comment Pertinence of the Discussion section whether it justify the main message of the manuscript without repeating the results.

Please use the following link to revise the introduction, expand the discussion, and update some references

[https://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=ar&as\\_sdt=0%2C5&q=Clinical+and+biochemical+profile+of+wasp+sting+patients+in+a+tertiary+care+hospital+in+Bangladesh&btnG=](https://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=ar&as_sdt=0%2C5&q=Clinical+and+biochemical+profile+of+wasp+sting+patients+in+a+tertiary+care+hospital+in+Bangladesh&btnG=)

#### Response

Discussion is revised and expanded (Lines 209-213 and 253-256). References are also added according to it (Lines 298-349).

#### 5. Comment Whether Strength(s) and Limitation(s) are well described.

The limitation(s) have been described. However, please add strength(s) of this study.

#### Response

We have added the strengths of this study (Lines 253-258).

#### 6. Comment Whether the manuscript is supported by appropriate and up-to-date References

Please use the following link to revise the introduction, expand the discussion, and update some references

[https://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=ar&as\\_sdt=0%2C5&q=Clinical+and+biochemical+profile+of+wasp+sting+patients+in+a+tertiary+care+hospital+in+Bangladesh&btnG=](https://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=ar&as_sdt=0%2C5&q=Clinical+and+biochemical+profile+of+wasp+sting+patients+in+a+tertiary+care+hospital+in+Bangladesh&btnG=)

#### Response

The References are updated and formatted as per the journal's format.

### Correspondence

Parash Ullah  
[drparashullah@gmail.com](mailto:drparashullah@gmail.com)

### Publication history

Received: 6 Jan 2025  
Accepted: 12 July 2025  
Published online: 24 July 2025

### Responsible editor

M Mostafa Zaman  
0000-0002-1736-1342

### Reviewers

Hazim Abdul Rahman Alhiti  
0000-0003-0000-8267  
MA Jalil Chowdhury  
0009-0002-9048-3693

### Keywords

*wasp sting, rhabdomyolysis, acute kidney injury, Vespa affinis*

### Funding

None

### Ethical approval

Approved by IRB of Sylhet MAG  
Osmani Medical College (No.  
somo/2014/700,  
dated 1 Mar 2014).

### Trial registration number

Not applicable

### Declaration

This article encompasses FCPS  
thesis of Dr Parash Ullah

- 7. Comment**      **Straightforward, clear, and logical Storytelling.**  
This section need some correction.
- Response**      Structure has been improved for flow and clarity. The Introduction and Discussion sections are also revised.
- 8. Comment**      **Standard of English for publication.**  
Please check the correctness of the grammar.
- Response**      We have reviewed language, grammar, tense consistency, and clarity improved throughout.

**Reviewer:** MA Jalil Chowdhury, 0009-0002-9048-3693

#### Overview

This study is relevant to our clinical problem and so demands publication. The overall style of manuscript writing is okay. The purposive sampling has weakened the study data. The conclusion which the most reader read at first hand should be more relevant to the study objectives and the study findings. The treatment protocol used should have been mentioned. It was not clear when the clinical features and biochemical features were recorded; is it on admission before stating treatment or during treatment? What treatment the particular patient received outside before collecting data. Because all these points modify the clinical and biochemical features. All these factors may remain as limitations of studying clinical and biochemical features of wasp bite.

- 9. Comment**      **Completeness and accuracy of the Abstract**  
In conclusion there is discrepancies between the result and the conclusion drawn. Rhabdomyolysis developed in all the cases is not highlighted neither in the result nor in the abstract. Key messages: Please explain from the study how the author came to conclusion that wasp stings are relatively common.
- Response**      We have highlighted Rhabdomyolysis in the Abstract and removed the discrepancy (Lines 37-44). We have also revised the Key messages.
- 10. Comment**      **Clarity and appropriateness of the Objective(s)**  
It is not clear why the Northeastern part of the country has been chosen for the study of wasp sting?
- Response**      This study was conducted as part of an FCPS thesis, with data collected from Sylhet MAG Osmani Medical College Hospital in Sylhet, Bangladesh. As a result, the northeastern region of the country was selected as the study area, reflecting the institutional setting and patient catchment population of the research site.
- 11. Comment**      **Clarity of the rationale for conducting the study is given in the Introduction section**  
It would have been better if the author could collect the local names of the wasps.
- Response**      We have added the local names of the wasp (Lines 120-121).
- 12. Comment**      **The Methods are described in sufficient details so that the study can be reproduced. Whether ethical concerns have been well described**  
Consecutive rather than purposive sampling would have been better for this study
- Response**      It will be a consecutive sampling technique as we have included all available participants who met the criteria until the desired sample size was reached (Lines 122-124).
- 13. Comment**      **Major redundancy between text and tables/figures in the Results section.**  
The first paragraph of the results section may be unnecessary. It would be better if the author included information on how the patients were treated. Additionally, mentioning that there were no fatalities would be helpful. Details regarding the number of patients requiring invasive treatments, such as dialysis, along with their outcomes, should also be provided for completeness.
- Response**      We have added a summary of standard supportive treatment and dialysis (Lines 145-151).
- 14. Comment**      **Pertinence of the Discussion section whether it justify the main message of the manuscript without repeating the results.**  
If the treatment followed had been described, it would have provided readers with a clearer understanding of the complications and outcomes related to the bite.
- Response**      We have added suggested treatment approach (Lines 209-213).
- 15. Comment**      **Whether Strength(s) and Limitation(s) are well described.**  
The limitations have been described, but it would be helpful if the strengths of the study were also mentioned.
- Response**      We have added a few lines on the strength of the study (Lines 253-256).
- 16. Comment**      **Whether the Conclusion of the manuscript is supported by the data**  
The conclusion should be based on the study objectives and consequently findings in the study. In conclusion there is discrepancies between the result and the conclusion drawn. Rhabdomyolysis developed in all the cases is not highlighted.
- Response**      We have revised the conclusion section as per your suggestions (Lines 268-272).
- 17. Comment**      **Whether the manuscript is supported by appropriate and up-to-date References**  
The references need to be formatted according to the journal's guidelines.
- Response**      We have re-formatted all references as per the journal's format.

**18. Comment** Standard of English for publication.  
Introduction Discussion part can be shortened.

**Response** We have revised the Introduction and Discussion part.

**Responsible editor:** M Mostafa Zaman, ORCID: 0000-0002-1736-1342

**19. Comment** The number of victims limits a details analysis. Splitting the subjects in to so many categories hardly provides practice guidance. Therefore, I suggest consolidating the information:

Table 1 has so many categories for the number of bites; It could be two only (<5- and .+50). Similarly the lag time could be one hour and > one hour.

**Response** We have updated Table 1: bite groups to <50 and ≥50; lag time to ≤1 hour and >1 hour (Table 1) (Lines 363-367).

**20. Comment** Considerign the message's simplicity, I recommend the authors to make the manuscript shorter: 1500 words, 3 tables / figures, and 20 references.

**Response** Thank you for your suggestion. Although the first reviewer suggested that we expand the article, we have tried our best to be in line with your suggestion. The Word count is now 2488 (excluding reference and abstract). Total number table and figures are 3 and References are 20 .

## ROUND 2

**Reviewer:** Hazim Abdul Rahman Alhiti, 0000-0003-0000-8267

**1. Comment** The revised file could be accepted.

**Response** Not required

**Reviewer:** MA Jalil Chowdhury, 0009-0002-9048-3693

**2. Comment** The revised file could be accepted.

**Response** Not required

**Responsible editor:** M Mostafa Zaman, ORCID: 0000-0002-1736-1342

**3. Comment** The Results (text) section should avoid redundancies with the tables and figures. The Results section could be much shorter. The text has fully covered Figure 1b. Therefore, Figure 1b is redundant to the text.

**Response** We have removed the figure 1b.

**4. Comment** Recommendation could be merged with the Conclusion briefly. Separate heading on the Recommendation is not as per the BSMMUJ's format.

**Response** Recommendation are merged into one section and edited accordingly.

**5. Comment** Although one reviewer suggested expanding the texts, the Editor suggested making it shorter for better readability. The Results and Discussion sections could be more succinct.

**Response** Thanks for understanding the reversal comments from the reviewers. One suggested expanding and one to shrink. However, as per your suggestions, we have done a major trimming of the result and discussion section. The word counts now came down to 1742 from 2690.