Response to Reviewers

Reviewer #1:
Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)
Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)
Conclusion: Accept (General priority)
Specific Comments to Authors: This is the first report of a small bowel perforation caused by V. parahaemolyticus infection. The report is well-written, all aspects of the clinical course are described and overall it is a very educational and informative paper. Definitely deserves publication.

Response: We would like to thank you for your positive feedback.

Science editor:

1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes a case report of spontaneous small bowel perforation secondary to vibrio parahaemolyticus infection. The topic is within the scope of the WJCC.

(1) Classification: Grade B;

(2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: The authors found that vibrio parahaemolyticus is a pathogen commonly associated with gastroenteritis following the consumption of seafood. Aside from supportive treatment with hydration and oral antibiotics, clinicians must be aware of the possible complication of acute abdomen which may require surgical intervention; and

(3) Format: There are 2 figures. A total of 9 references are cited, including 3 references published in the last 3 years. There are no self-citations.

2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade B. A language editing certificate issued by Editage was provided.

3 Academic norms and rules: The authors provided the written informed consent and CARE Checklist–2016. Please provide the signed Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure Form and Copyright License Agreement. No academic misconduct was found in the CrossCheck detection and Bing search.

4 Supplementary comments: This is an unsolicited manuscript. The topic has not previously been published in the WJCC. The corresponding author has not published articles in the BPG.

5 Issues raised: (1) I found the authors did not provide the original figures. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor.

6 Re-Review: Required.

7 Recommendation: Conditionally accepted.

Response: Thank you for your detailed feedback. As per your instruction we have uploaded the signed conflict of interest forms and Copyright License Agreement form in the submission system.

Also, we have provided original figure files using PowerPoint as per your instruction.

Editorial office director: I have checked the comments written by the science editor.

(3) ***Company editor-in-chief:*** I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, the full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Clinical Cases, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors.

Before final acceptance, uniform presentation should be used for figures showing the same or similar contents; for example, "Figure 1Pathological changes of atrophic gastritis after treatment. A: ...; B: ...; C: ...; D: ...; E: ...; F: ...; G: ...".

Response: We would like to thank you for your positive feedback.