

# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 75793

Title: Pseudomonas aeruginosa-related effusive-constrictive pericarditis diagnosed with

echocardiography: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05506329

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MBBS, MD

Professional title: Attending Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Nepal

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-02-18

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-02-18 02:27

Reviewer performed review: 2022-02-26 11:43

Review time: 8 Days and 9 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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



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

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Whole of the article is nicely written. After going through the manuscript, I felt that title and the content of the manuscript are not coherent. So, I suggest to revise the title.



# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 75793

Title: Pseudomonas aeruginosa-related effusive-constrictive pericarditis diagnosed with

echocardiography: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06142379

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-02-18

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-02-23 05:54

Reviewer performed review: 2022-02-27 16:49

Review time: 4 Days and 10 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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



# Baishideng **Publishing**

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

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

#### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an original manuscript about a rare case of effusive-constrictive pericarditis caused by Pseudomonas Aeruginosa. This study highlights the key role of a non-invasive and economic tool (echocardiography) for the diagnosis and follow-up of this condition, but I think it's more important to focus on the rare aetiology of pericarditis, reporting more details about Pseudomonas Aeruginosa patient's infection and risk factors. You prepared the manuscript correctly according to the CARE check-list Case report. Did you explore patient's risk factors and conditions predisposing to contract the Pseudomonas Aeruginosa infection? Could you add a baseline 2D-TTE image and/or video, before performing pericardiocentesis? Why did not you observe the pericardial thickness at the first TTE? Did you perform a cardiac catheterization? Did you administer medical treatment to the patient before pericardiectomy? There are other essential signs in ruling out constrictive pericarditis on M-Mode, like the posterior motion of the septum during early diastole on inspiration. Could you cite them with corresponding references? I think you should improve grammar and style, especially for the abstract.



## **RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT**

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 75793

Title: Pseudomonas aeruginosa-related effusive-constrictive pericarditis diagnosed with

echocardiography: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05506329

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MBBS, MD

Professional title: Attending Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Nepal

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-02-18

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ping Yan

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-04-17 05:17

Reviewer performed review: 2022-04-17 11:05

Review time: 5 Hours

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	<ul> <li>[ ] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority)</li> <li>[ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection</li> </ul>
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous





statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you for your response and continuous effort.