

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 86974

Title: Reconstruction of the lower back wound with delayed infection after spinal surgery: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03809896

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Iran

Author's Country/Territory: South Korea

Manuscript submission date: 2023-07-18

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-07-29 17:27

Reviewer performed review: 2023-08-03 19:42

Review time: 5 Days and 2 Hours

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 Grade E: Do not publish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 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

Comments on: "Reconstruction of the Lower Wound with Delayed Infection after Spinal Surgery: A Case Report and Review of the Literature" 1. Please explain common post surgery infections and their treatment methods in the introduction section. 2. It is better to use more recent references in the manuscript. 3. Please add labels A and B to Figure 3. 4. Please add a abbreviations' list.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 86974

Title: Reconstruction of the lower back wound with delayed infection after spinal surgery: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03448879

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Chief Doctor, Deputy Director, Professor, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: South Korea

Manuscript submission date: 2023-07-18

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-08-01 10:50

Reviewer performed review: 2023-08-10 07:01

Review time: 8 Days and 20 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input 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

It is a well-written case report on surgical site infection and surgical wound dehiscence.

1. How was the patients' blood glucose level controlled after flap surgery? 2. Ciprofloxacin was chosen by experience or drug sensitivity test? 3. Figure 3B: the suspicious soft tissue phlegmon and interspinous reconstruction wire should be marked in the picture. 4. Language editing would be helpful to improving the quality of this case report.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 86974

Title: Reconstruction of the lower back wound with delayed infection after spinal surgery: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 04247363

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: DDS, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: France

Author's Country/Territory: South Korea

Manuscript submission date: 2023-07-18

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-08-03 17:31

Reviewer performed review: 2023-08-12 06:36

Review time: 8 Days and 13 Hours

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 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

Dear authors, We have read with interest your manuscript relating a case report and review of the literature. The manuscript is clear and well presented, with well described problematics. It presents an important insight about the difficulties to deal with delayed infection, which is of prime importance for practitioners. In our understanding, the main information of the manuscript is the recommendation and guideline for re-intervention, taking into account all the data and analyses (that are often not clear and easy to interpret). The title of the manuscript describe a case report and a review of the literature : the case report is very well documented, but the review of literature is less obvious and is mainly used for the discussion section. The Background/Introduction section presents the problematics of Surgical wound dehiscence and surgical site infection, but lacks of literature survey, especially for up-to-date recommendations for SWD treatments. The manuscript would be strenghten by improving this aspect in the Introduction, and by adding some objectives of the work (i.e actualized recommendations for SWD management in case of delayed SSI). In the same idea, by improving the literature survey, the conclusion section could include some propositions

of pragmatic recommendation that would be of very interest for clinicians. Remark about units (SI) : the CRP value is presented as mg/dl, which is meaningful for clinicians, but might be expressed as nmol/L to respect the requirements of use of SI units