

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 84370

Title: Diagnostic use of superb microvascular imaging in evaluating septic arthritis of the manubriosternal joint: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05089997

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: Doctor, MD, PhD

Professional title: Consultant Physician-Scientist, Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Romania

Author's Country/Territory: Lithuania

Manuscript submission date: 2023-03-14

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-04-03 09:44

Reviewer performed review: 2023-04-08 09:42

Review time: 4 Days and 23 Hours

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 Grade E: Do not publish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

Diagnostic use of superb microvascular imaging in evaluating septic arthritis of the manubriosternal joint: A case report The paper describes a case report of septic arthritis of the manubriosternal joint, that underlines the rarity of this pathology and the complex process of diagnosis. The subject of the paper is relevant for clinicians, as it emphasizes the difficulty of a prompt and early diagnosis of a septic arthritis with this type of localization, given the anatomy of the joint. Imaging techniques that provide the clinician with tools to promptly manage such a case, especially when more costly methods are not available, are essential to the medical practice. An early diagnosis means providing treatment in the first stages of the pathology and, thus, lessens the potential burden of disease. The paper is overall well organized and has a high degree of language clarity. However, there are some points that may be further improved. 1. While the preferred font in medical articles is Times New Roman, the World Journal of Clinical Cases uses Calibri as a font for articles. Please regard this potential change to your manuscript. 2. Please use Justify throughout the whole manuscript. 3. Ideally, the abstract is comprised of approximately 200-250 words. Please take into consideration

making it more concise. 4. Please consider using the same indentation before the start of a paragraph throughout the paper. 5. Please evaluate the following issues regarding grammar errors and content:

- line 135 - Please consider using “with a five-day history of”.
- line 141 - “There were no obvious objective symptoms in the chest.” - The sentence is unclear as symptoms are inherently subjective. Please consider rephrasing it.
- Line 155 - Please consider using “minute” instead of “min”.
- Line 157 - Please consider stating the BMI at the beginning of the Physical examination.
- Line 168 - Bearing in mind that the electrocardiogram evaluates the electric activity of the heart, without showing direct images, I consider that adding information regarding this evaluation to be inappropriately added under “imaging examination”.
- Line 170 - Please consider adding whether the computer tomography was done using contrast.
- Line 172 - Please consider introducing the meaning of PD in text.
- Line 196 - Please consider using “No other findings in the transthoracic echocardiogram were detected” instead of “Any other findings in the transthoracic echocardiogram were not detected”.
- Line 257 - Please take into account using “to consider” instead of “for considering”.
- Line 296 - Please use “until” instead of “till”, as it is more formal.
- Line 480 - Please use “The surfaces of the MS joint”.
- Line 484 - Captions must be placed above tables.

After analyzing the manuscript, it may be considered for publication after making these minor changes.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 84370

Title: Diagnostic use of superb microvascular imaging in evaluating septic arthritis of the manubriosternal joint: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05213310

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Adjunct Professor, Full Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Saudi Arabia

Author's Country/Territory: Lithuania

Manuscript submission date: 2023-03-14

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-04-17 14:05

Reviewer performed review: 2023-04-17 14:34

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" 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 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

Please make the following modifications: 1. In the research abstract, just the most essential findings/results of the present study should be clarified without delving into detail. 2. The study's introduction should be limited to three paragraphs, with the first paragraph expressing the importance of the current study, the second paragraph expressing the knowledge gap that the current study seeks to fill, and the final paragraph expressing the current research problem and how to solve it within the framework of the study's goal. current. 3. The final paragraph of the discussion should be devoted to outlining the limits of the present study as well as assessing its positives. I would urge the author(s) to define the present study's future directions in the final paragraph of the discussion. 4. The study's conclusion must be reviewed to determine whether the research problem has been solved or whether the present study has achieved the aim for which it was created. 5. Some of the research references are outdated and should be updated. Please be aware of using references from 2019 to 2023. 6. Are the images linked to the work of the study team, or are they from elsewhere? If it is not the product of the research team, please specify that it protects intellectual



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

property rights and third-party rights. 7. There were a few minor spelling and typographical problems that should be fixed. Good luck,