

Review of: "Monkeypox among linked heterosexual casual partners in Bayelsa, Nigeria"

Tamara Prinsenbergh

Potential competing interests: The author(s) declared that no potential competing interests exist.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this interesting manuscript, which is very timely and relevant. The authors have concisely described each case of monkey pox, have put a lot of effort into partner tracing and have made epidemiological links.

The study shows that casual heterosexual contact is a likely transmission route of MPX. This is of great importance as sexual transmission is mostly reported in gay men in the global North and not in heterosexual men and women. The recognition of the sexual transmission route is the first step to an appropriate public health response.

I also believe the authors have to be mindful of possible transmission between partners during sex because of close skin-to-skin contact. More details of the type of sex acts (i.e. oral sex, vaginal sex, contact with lesions of partner's genital area), if these are available, would improve the manuscript. If all cases had contact with MPX lesions, the possible role of infectious genital fluids would be masked. Maybe this is worth reflecting on.

The fact that all cases had lesions in their genital area is a strong indicator of sexual transmission.

Could you please give the case definitions of confirmed monkey pox and suspected monkey pox. It is mentioned that the Nigerian guidelines are used, but not everyone is familiar with these guidelines. It would make it easier to read/interpret with the case definition.

I support the publication of this paper and congratulate the authors on this work!