



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology
Manuscript NO: 37534
Title: The first case of Clostridium paraputrificum septicemia and liver abscess
Reviewer’s code: 00058381
Reviewer’s country: Austria
Science editor: Li-Jun Cui
Date sent for review: 2017-12-22
Date reviewed: 2017-12-28
Review time: 6 Days

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this manuscript the authors describe a patient with Clostridium paraputrificum septicemia and liver abscess and provide an overview on the literature. Title: “The first case of Clostridium paraputrificum septicemia and liver abscess” - I would suggest leaving out “the first case” or writing “the first published case”. Informed consent statement: “care report” -> case report. Discussion, paragraph 3, third sentence: “Similar findings were reported from another single center series from South Korea, where 76% were found to have diabetes when comparing 25 patients with GFPLA against 254 NGFPLA patients [18].” - What was the percentage of NGFPLA patients with diabetes? Moreover, the overall number of patients in this study was 379; 379 minus 25 would be 354, not 254 (?). Discussion, paragraph 3, last sentence: “Enterococcus” -> Enterococcus. Discussion, paragraph 4, second sentence: “Clostridum” -> Clostridium. Discussion, paragraph 5, fourth sentence: “In our 37



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

cases of *C. perfringens* hepatic abscess cases, the mortality rate was 67.6% (25/37)." -> In the 37 cases of *C. perfringens* hepatic abscess, the mortality rate was 67.6% (25/37). Discussion, paragraph 5, ninth sentence: "Among those who survived, 6 patients (50%) were found to have poly-microbial infection, suggesting that having a poly-microbial infection is a potentially good prognostic factor." - The patient numbers are too small for this statement. Discussion, paragraph 7, second sentence: "27 years old" -> "27 years". Table 1: Please cite all the publications mentioned here and include them in the reference list; "vascularitis" -> vasculitis; "whipple" -> Whipple; "presense of liver mass" -> presence of liver mass.



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

Manuscript NO: 37534

Title: The first case of Clostridium paraputrificum septicemia and liver abscess

Reviewer's code: 02822816

Reviewer's country: Romania

Science editor: Li-Jun Cui

Date sent for review: 2017-12-26

Date reviewed: 2017-12-29

Review time: 3 Days

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

To the authors, Interesting and well-written case-report.