PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 72409

Title: The Diagnosis of Cytomegalovirus Encephalitis using Metagenomic Next-Generation Sequencing of Blood and Cerebrospinal Fluid: A Case Report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05448835

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: BSc, MSc, PhD

Professional title: Research Scientist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Bangladesh

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-10-15

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-10-22 16:25

Reviewer performed review: 2021-10-22 16:29

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No

| **Peer-reviewer statements** | Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous   [   ] Onymous |
| | Conflicts-of-Interest: [   ] Yes   [Y] No |

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Need some details of the report. Critical view is missing. Needs to improve the results analysis and add more details. References are poor. Add   8-10 recent literatures.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 72409

Title: The Diagnosis of Cytomegalovirus Encephalitis using Metagenomic Next-Generation Sequencing of Blood and Cerebrospinal Fluid: A Case Report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05936182

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Thailand

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-10-15

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-11-06 16:32

Reviewer performed review: 2021-11-06 16:48

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Firstly, thank you for opportunity to review very interested article. I don't feel qualified to judge about the English language and style   1. The title reflect the main subject about diagnosis of CMV encephalitis from blood and CSF, title was clear and easy to understand.   2. The abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript. However, I suggested the authors to revised this sentence "Cytomegalovirus (CMV) infection is very common in the population" because I think not very common. 3. The key words reflect the focus of the manuscript.   4. The manuscript adequately describe the background, present status, and significance of the study. The authors explain pathogenesis of CMV infection. In line 48 "CMV infection is very common in the population" please revised about that.   5. The manuscript describe methods in adequate detail, study subjects were clear, with demonstrate IRB number or text to human ethics consideration. The detail of case presentation was complete and easy to understand.   6. The research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study.   7. The manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly, and logically.   8. Tables and figures sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents. However Figure 2 A B D were poor quality, please revised about that.   9. The manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections.