

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 60373

Title: Tertiary peritonitis: A disease that should not be ignored

Reviewer's code: 02941488

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Germany

Author's Country/Territory: Brazil

Manuscript submission date: 2020-10-27

Reviewer chosen by: Ya-Juan Ma

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-12-17 08:33

Reviewer performed review: 2020-12-23 14:10

Review time: 6 Days and 5 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Marques et al present a review on tertiary peritonitis, which nicely fills a gap in the lack of current literature on the subject. Major remarks: - The authors may provide more practical information for the readers: e.g., when to suspect tertiary peritonitis, what diagnostic measures are needed, what cut-off values of the scoring systems should be used: it is all in the manuscript, but the authors could make it easier for the clinicians reading the paper to get to the key messages. Minor remarks: - The quality of English language may be improved - *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* should not be classified as multi-resistant bacterium. - There is some contradiction within the review if multiresistant bacteria (rather not) or *E. Coli*, enterococci etc. (page 5) are the most frequent pathogens in tertiary peritonitis - The authors should provide threshold values of the different scoring systems (MPI...) that should raise the suspicion of tertiary peritonitis. - I suppose it should be "more than 500 leukocytes/ μ l" and not / mL on page 8. - First paragraph on page 9: do authors argue about 2 or three entities? The alternative concept by anatomic integrity and clinical severity should be explained better - Page 9: the authors should clarify that spontaneous is primary peritonitis - Reference 40 is not explained clearly: it should be stressed that on-demand laparotomy reduced secondary outcomes - The layout of table 1 is distorted

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 60373

Title: Tertiary peritonitis: A disease that should not be ignored

Reviewer's code: 02941488

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Germany

Author's Country/Territory: Brazil

Manuscript submission date: 2020-10-27

Reviewer chosen by: Chen-Chen Gao

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-01-11 08:14

Reviewer performed review: 2021-01-13 18:29

Review time: 2 Days and 10 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I thank the authors for incorporating nearly all of my suggestions. Two issues are left: 1)



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

spelling error at the bottom of page 9: "or who have are at a high risk": delete have 2) issue number 3: the authors are correct that their source indicates that the values of peritoneal leukocytes are /ml. However, their source is wrong: it must be per μl : in the source, values are also given for primary /spontaneous peritonitis as per ml, but as you might verify in every international guideline on that topic, it must be per μl or mm^3 (250 cells or 500 cells / μl)