

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-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 86446

Title: Delayed-onset Micrococcus luteus-induced postoperative endophthalmitis several

months after cataract surgery

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05327699 **Position:** Editorial Board

Academic degree: MBBS, MNAMS, MS

Professional title: Additional Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: South Korea

Manuscript submission date: 2023-06-26

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-08-09 06:52

Reviewer performed review: 2023-08-09 07:17

Review time: 1 Hour

	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] 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	[] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish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:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.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) [Y] Accept (General priority) [] 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

Dear Authors, 1. Excellent case-report by the authors and a well managed case. 2. Were both the sugeries done on the same day? what were the findings of other eye?

3. Why the culture and antibiotic sensitivity not done during every vitreous - tapping?

As there were multiple recurrences and non - response to conventional intra -vitreal antibiotics?

4. Add one para regarding antibiotic - resistance in current scenario and it's prevention. Thanks