

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

Manuscript NO: 37316

Title: Spontaneous Bacterial and Fungal Peritonitis in Patients with Liver Cirrhosis: A Literature Review

Reviewer's code: 00725712

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Na Ma

Date sent for review: 2017-11-28

Date reviewed: 2017-11-29

Review time: 14 Hours

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input 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 checked="" 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"/> 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

This is an interesting review article on spontaneous bacterial and fungal peritonitis in patients with advanced liver disease. The manuscript is very well written; clear, precise, and easy to understand. Author should include a new brief section on antimicrobial stewardship to optimise management of SBP and SFP.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

Manuscript NO: 37316

Title: Spontaneous Bacterial and Fungal Peritonitis in Patients with Liver Cirrhosis: A Literature Review

Reviewer's code: 00012506

Reviewer's country: United Kingdom

Science editor: Na Ma

Date sent for review: 2017-11-28

Date reviewed: 2017-12-08

Review time: 9 Days

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] 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"/> [Y] 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"/> [Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a comprehensive careful review of SBP and SFP. Although, there is one part missing which is a review on the method to make diagnosis, author talk about new methods, but hasn't mentioned how it is recommended to do the PMN cell count, manual? or automated? what characteristics the automated cell counter need? which is best? Apart from that, minor language polishing is needed (i.e. ascitic fluid instead of ascites fluid). well done!

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

Manuscript NO: 37316

Title: Spontaneous Bacterial and Fungal Peritonitis in Patients with Liver Cirrhosis: A Literature Review

Reviewer's code: 02462032

Reviewer's country: Spain

Science editor: Na Ma

Date sent for review: 2017-11-28

Date reviewed: 2017-12-08

Review time: 9 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" 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

See file attached

I have read with interest the review of dr Shizuma about SBP and fungal peritonitis.

I have some comments.

1. There are many references but many are other reviews. In general, try to reference the original papers and not others reviews except by meta-analysis. Please review all the references and try to avoid this.
2. The abstract is not clear and should be improved.
3. When discussing phisiopathology of SBP, I missed some comments about bacterial overgrowth.
4. When explaining infection secondary to MDR bacteria in cirrhosis is important the



**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

reference (Ariza et al. Third generation cephalosporins resistant SBP: Hepatology 2012). In this paper the rate of TGC resistant SBP in community, health care-related and nosocomial SBP are shown in very large sample of SBP.

5. Last sentence page 9, secondary SBP means recurrent SBP? What about nprfloxacin? Reference 63 is about omeprazole.

6. Some comments about diferential diagnosis between SBP and secondary bacterial peritonitis should be added. Please study paper about this issue of Runyon and the paper of Soriano et al about secondary bacterial peritonitis in cirrhotic patients in J Hepatol 2010.

7. Ascitic fluid culture should be performed in blood-culture bottles. Some comments and appropriate references should be added.

8. In the first sentence about usefulness of reagent strips for diagnosis you cite a review, please consider, Castellote et al. Rapid diagnosis of SBP by use of regant strips. Hepatology 2003.

9. Prediction of mortality please consider: Tandom et al. The 10-30 rule in SBP: Am J Gastroenterol.

10. Albumin role in therapy of SBP should be better discussed. Doses and cases in which may be beneficial.

11. In page 19, decrease of PMn count of more than 25%,and prognosis, the first study was of Akriviadis and Runyon, please cite.

12. About SFP, is very uncommon, and clear recommendations about treatment and more important the oportunity of empirical antifungal therapy should be very interesting.