

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 71661

Title: Amniotic membrane transplantation in a patient with impending perforated corneal ulcer caused by Streptococcus mitis: a case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 04123581

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Taiwan

Manuscript submission date: 2021-09-21

Reviewer chosen by: Xin Liu (Online Science Editor)

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-12-14 01:39

Reviewer performed review: 2021-12-17 10:58

Review time: 3 Days and 9 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [Y] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish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) [] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [] Rejection
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: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous
statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This case report described a patient with persistent corneal ulcer caused by Streptococcus mitis infection, who was treated with sensitive antibiotics in combination with AMT, resulting in ulcer healing and better vision. The treatment of Streptococcus mitis and the long follow-up time after operation and good vision recovery are the highlights of this paper. There are some issues as follows: 1. Active infection is a contraindication for AMT, so it is not suitable for patients with uncontrolled infective corneal ulcer. This case can be regarded as an AMT performed after the pathogen was completely eliminated 2 weeks after antibiotic administration, which needs to be mentioned in the discussion so as not to mislead readers. 2. Please supplement preoperative OCT images: In Figure 1, the authors showed the slit lamp front segment photograph of the corneal ulcer, but did not provide relevant OCT images of the cornea, so the actual ulcer depth and residual corneal thickness could not be determined. OCT images in FIG. 2 showed that there was no obvious thinning of the cornea at the lesion, so it could be inferred that the residual thickness of the cornea before AMT would not be too thin. It is debatable whether she can be diagnosed as descemetocele and whether there is a risk of perforation. 3. Corneal persistent ulcer causes more, combined with the patient history, break out repeatedly sexually jealous consider viruses, neurotrophic factors, vancomycin toxicity, ulcer surface deeper cause tears dry coating uneven factors are likely, in AMT can try to stop using vancomycin, preoperative use oil ointment, serum eye drops for conservative treatment. The origin and preservation time of the amniotic membrane are not mentioned. The logic of the treatment is not perfect. There are many reasons for persistent corneal ulcer. In combination with the patient's previous



history of recurrent redness of the eye, viral factors, neurotrophic disorders, vancomycin toxicity, and uneven tear coating due to deep ulcer surface may be considered. Vancomycin can be stopped before AMT, and oil ointment and serum eye drops can be used for conservative treatment. The origin and preservation time of the amniotic membrane are not mentioned. The logic of the treatment is not perfect. 4. Discussion is too thin: the role of AMT in this case is not fully developed. In addition to covering the wound, promoting wound healing, anti-inflammatory, and acting as the basement membrane for epithelial growth, amniotic membrane may also have played a role in avoiding tear coating disorder on ulcer surface and isolating antibiotic toxicity in this case. 5. Please add the latest references: 3/14 is in recent 5 years, 0 is in recent 3 years.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 71661

Title: Amniotic membrane transplantation in a patient with impending perforated corneal ulcer caused by Streptococcus mitis: a case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 00503243

Position: Editor-in-Chief

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: Taiwan

Manuscript submission date: 2021-09-21

Reviewer chosen by: Xin Liu (Online Science Editor)

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-12-13 15:48

Reviewer performed review: 2021-12-18 13:36

Review time: 4 Days and 21 Hours

Scientific quality	[Y] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [] 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	[Y] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[]Yes [Y]No



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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an excellent case report on the use of Amniotic membrane transplant to cure corneal lesion due to Streptococcus mitis. The manuscript is well written and innovative as it concerns a new method to treat this lesion.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 71661

Title: Amniotic membrane transplantation in a patient with impending perforated corneal ulcer caused by Streptococcus mitis: a case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03814168

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Pakistan

Author's Country/Territory: Taiwan

Manuscript submission date: 2021-09-21

Reviewer chosen by: Xin Liu (Online Science Editor)

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-12-17 03:28

Reviewer performed review: 2021-12-20 04:31

Review time: 3 Days and 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] 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) [] Minor revision [Y] 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

 In the abstract author referred to previous clinical case report, which require citation of that report.
 The conclusion for vision is drawn on 67 months follow-up. It is recommended to include a table and present the vision score by time dependent manner.
 In the discussion authors need to focus on why AMT graft is successful. A brief mechanism should be discussed.
 Typo and grammatical errors need corrections.



RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 71661

Title: Amniotic membrane transplantation in a patient with impending perforated corneal ulcer caused by Streptococcus mitis: a case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 04123581

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Taiwan

Manuscript submission date: 2021-09-21

Reviewer chosen by: Ya-Juan Ma

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-02-10 05:03

Reviewer performed review: 2022-02-10 05:23

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) [Y] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous



Baishideng 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

statements

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The biggest defect of this article is that there is no preoperative OCT that can accurately measure the preoperative corneal thickness, and slit lamp cannot accurately evaluate the preoperative corneal thickness, so it is less convincing for the very important visual recovery effect mentioned in this case.