

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

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Virology

Manuscript NO: 89135

Title: Cytomegalovirus infection in non-immunocompromised critically ill patients: A

management perspective

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02489089 Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: BSc, MSc, PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor, Doctor, Nurse, Teacher

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Austria

Author's Country/Territory: India

Manuscript submission date: 2023-10-21

Reviewer chosen by: Yu-Lu Chen

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-12-06 08:54

Reviewer performed review: 2023-12-12 12:57

Review time: 6 Days and 4 Hours

	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C:
Scientific quality	Good
	[] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair
this manuscript	[] Grade D: No creativity or innovation



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

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No scientific significance
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	[]Yes [Y]No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

First of all, I am very pleased to have the opportunity to review your manuscript. Here is my evaluation: The title reflects the main topic of the manuscript. The abstract summarizes the work described in the manuscript well, the keywords reflect the focus of your manuscript and describe the background, current status and significance of your review in a broad and meaningful way. What is missing in your explanations is the exact procedure in the selection of articles for the review. Here you should explain exactly how you proceeded in the selection of literature, what the inclusion and exclusion criteria of the literature reviewed were. The aim of the review is well achieved, even if there are still gaps in the methodology. The contribution of your review is clinically relevant. The manuscript adequately and appropriately links the results found and emphasizes the most important points concisely, clearly and logically. The conclusion is comprehensible overall, but could have been more precise. The tables are sufficient, of good quality and illustrate the content of the work in an appropriate manner. The manuscript cites a wide range of references, some of which are older, including the most recent and authoritative references in an appropriate manner. Your Reviewer



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA

Telephone: +1-925-399-1568 E-mail: office@baishideng.com

https://www.wjgnet.com