

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 84892

Title: Next-generation sequencing technology for the diagnosis of
Pneumocystis pneumonia in an immunocompetent female: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 00646503

Position: Editor-in-Chief

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-04-04

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-04-18 14:04

Reviewer performed review: 2023-04-18 15:47

Review time: 1 Hour

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 Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input 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
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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

I have read with interest the paper by Jing-Ji Huang et al. "Next-generation sequencing technology for the diagnosis of Pneumocystis pneumonia in an immunocompetent female: A case report". In this manuscript, the authors illustrate a case report on the detection of Pneumocystis pneumonia using next-generation sequencing (NGS). The case is quite interesting both for the remarkably rare event of infection of a young immunocompetent patient and for the use of NGS applied to this type of pathology. The paper is scientifically accurate and complete. Results are provide useful information to the field. The reference section is adequate, updated and appropriate to back up the points made in the article. The study conveys a clear-cut message. I have no major comments on this paper. However, it is necessary for the authors to perform a small implementation. It would be interesting to understand the rationale behind the suspicion of Pneumocystis infection and how the choice to perform an NGS analysis came about. The authors should also specify the kit and instrument used to perform the NGS analysis. The authors should also specify the kit and instrument used to perform the NGS analysis. The Kit included, for instance, a multi-target plate including many

pathogen microorganisms; nevertheless, was a Pneumocystis-specific analysis performed? The authors must clarify this point.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 84892

Title: Next-generation sequencing technology for the diagnosis of
Pneumocystis pneumonia in an immunocompetent female: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02439575

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Taiwan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-04-04

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-05-02 12:53

Reviewer performed review: 2023-05-10 14:02

Review time: 8 Days and 1 Hour

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
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
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
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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

1. This manuscript is a case report. It is interesting to use NGS to diagnose the PCP from fungal infection. However, it is not clear if this female patient had HIV infection. 2. There is little description about the process of NGS in material and method, and the data about NGS is too simple to make the connection between the gene detection and other test parameters. 3. I suggest to have a section of result to fully state the result of NGS, and how it can help the diagnosis of PCP. It looks like the description of NGS was only in the Discussion section.