

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 83462

**Title:** Fatal hemophagocytic lymphohistiocytosis-induced multiorgan dysfunction secondary to Burkholderia pseudomallei sepsis: A case report

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 06187298

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor, Chief Physician, Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Romania

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-09-04

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-09-04 08:28

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-09-09 12:47

**Review time:** 5 Days and 4 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<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
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

REVIEW OF MANUSCRIPT ID: 83462-60403    Congratulations for this very interesting case presentation regarding a very rare case of Burkholderia pseudomallei-induces septic shock. From this article both intensive care unit and infectious diseases doctors could benefit alike.    This is my report regarding the submitted paper.    1. Title. The title does reflect properly the content of the manuscript, but I suggest adding “literature review” to properly reflect the type of article.    2. Abstract. The abstract reflects very well all aspects of the manuscript; however, I fail to understand why mentioning BP infection being a biological weapon brings any scientific value to this manuscript. Authors should restrain to a brief morphological description of the bacteria, such as type of gram, polar or bipolar, motility, overall shape and, of course, its full scientific classification (phylum, class, order, family, genus, etc).    3. Key Words. Well chosen.    4. Introduction. This section is well constructed and has enough citations.    5. Case presentation sections: - all subsections are properly constructed; - the authors provide a CARE Checklist (2016) statement.    6. Discussion. Please move the actual figure (figure 1) at the first appearance in text – Section 2 – Case Presentation – Imaging examinations,

where it belongs. 7. Conclusions. Please move Figure 2, containing the bone marrow histological investigation to Section 2 – Case Presentation – Bone marrow smear, where it belongs. 8. Illustrations and tables. Tables are properly redacted. The figures are good for publishing. 9. Biostatistics. Not applicable. 10. Units. All units are standard. 11. References. The list of 13 references is adequate, and so is the timespan. 12. Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. It is fit for publication. 13. Backmatter section. It is properly redacted, even though it is place at the front of the article. 14. Ethics statements. It is missing; even though the authors provide a written consent for publication on behalf of the patient, a proper ethics committee approval was not provided. Conclusion: The paper needs a minor review prior to being considered for publishing.