

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 59928

Title: Postoperative Pain Due to an Occult Spinal Infection: A Case Report

Reviewer's code: 00526025

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: France

Manuscript submission date: 2020-10-13

Reviewer chosen by: Le Zhang

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-11-04 07:58

Reviewer performed review: 2020-11-10 06:35

Review time: 5 Days and 22 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" 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

You report a patient whose unrecognized spinal infection flared up after spinal surgery. I think your report is valuable for every physician treating patients with spinal pain. General comments: You need to clearly state the clinical course, and physical and laboratory findings of the patient. Specific comments: I do not think "Unexplained" in the title is essential because the pain is explainable. Line 5: I think "undergoing invasive procedures" should be "underwent invasive procedures." Line 7: I think "6 weeks" should be "1.5 months." Line 11: You did not describe "a spinal infiltrate 6 weeks prior to surgery" in the clinical course of the patient. You did not mention "Staphylococcus aureus was isolated from bacteriological samples taken at revision surgery" in the clinical course of the patient. Lines 22 to 26: I do not think "...spinal injections." is necessary. Line 50: You need to clearly state when preoperative MRI scan was done. In addition, you need to clearly state if the MRI scan showed the presence of inflammatory findings of the L4/5 area. Line 70: You need to state what and how much pain medications the patient took. Lines 80 to 81: You need to state if there were findings suggestive of infection when you did microdiscectomy and foraminotomy. Did you use any antibiotics before and after the first surgery? Line 102: You describe "blood cultures were taken, which showed Gram-positive cocci." However, you write in the abstract "Staphylococcus aureus was isolated from bacteriological samples taken at revision surgery." These descriptions were inconsistent. You need to describe the name of the bacteria instead of "Gram-positive cocci" and the results of sensitivity tests of the cocci to antibiotics. Lines 115 to 122: I cannot understand how the antibiotics were given to the patient. I cannot understand "picc." Lines 134 to 137: The description "We presume that... infection." should be moved to discussion. Line 154: I would recommend "SAFJ" be spelled out. I would recommend you mention why the signs and symptoms of the infection developed

contralateral side to the surgery. END

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 59928

Title: Postoperative Pain Due to an Occult Spinal Infection: A Case Report

Reviewer's code: 00526025

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: France

Manuscript submission date: 2020-10-13

Reviewer chosen by: Man Liu (Part-Time Editor)

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-12-31 12:08

Reviewer performed review: 2021-01-02 08:26

Review time: 1 Day and 20 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" 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
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 think you have amended the manuscript satisfactorily. I have only three suggestions.



**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>

1. Abstract Conclusion "Patients with spinal pain" would be better than "spinal patients." 2. Introduction Line 7: "0.01 to 0.1 %" would be better than "0.1 to 0.01%." 3. Case presentation "Operative findings" would be better than "Physical examination." END