

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 65489

Title: Primary liver actinomyces in a pediatric patient: A case report

Reviewer's code: 02461932

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-03-11

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-03-11 04:51

Reviewer performed review: 2021-03-11 16:21

Review time: 11 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 Grade E: Do not publish
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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" 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

The authors presented a pediatric case of primary liver actinomycosis and a literature review. This article is new in that she was the first pediatric patient with primary liver actinomycosis in English literature. The manuscript is somehow redundant. Title: OK
Abstract: OK Introduction: OK Case Presentation: line 3. Dots might be replaced with nodules I recommend the authors add a Figure of representative CT images of the hepatic lesion. Discussion: The authors say that "Multipathogen infections may be important in the invasion process; for instance, in the liver, which is an oxygen-rich organ, anaerobic actinomycosis may require the presence of aerobic bacteria to initiate the invasion process." I speculate that this sentence implies that aerobic bacteria consume oxygen, and lead the hepatic microenvironment to an anoxic state, and subsequently, anaerobic Actinomycosis can grow? The authors say, "histological diagnosis is more sensitive than pathological diagnosis because 89% (17/19) of cases in this review were histologically diagnosed." Possibly 'cytological diagnosis' might be appropriate rather than 'pathological diagnosis'? Moreover, I don't think that sensitivity of histological diagnosis can be discussed in this sentence because sensitivity is defined as the proportion of positives that are correctly identified. Or replace sensitive with frequent.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 65489

Title: Primary liver actinomyces in a pediatric patient: A case report

Reviewer's code: 02461932

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-03-11

Reviewer chosen by: Man Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-04-21 14:14

Reviewer performed review: 2021-04-21 15:06

Review time: 1 Hour

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
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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
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

The authors says that the manuscript was amended according to the reviewer's

comments. However, it was hard to know where and how the changes were made because no underlined-revised files were attached and revised sentences were not described in the response to the reviewer. I could not find even "nodules" in the text. Discussion: "This is a common challenge in actinomycosis cases because 13/89 cases were suspected to be malignant, and biopsy or surgery were performed to obtain the final diagnosis, leading to a prolonged admission period and higher costs." I don't think there were as much as 89 cases. 19 in total? Figure 1. Chest radiograph is not mentioned in the manuscript but chest CT is. Chest CT might be more useful than chest radiograph if there were some specific findings on CT. Figure 1 and 2. The authors need to closely describe the findings of those medical images in Figure legends. For example, location, tumor size, peritumoral edema. Table Add your case in the table.