Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

1. Relevance of the title to the content of the article

Regular

The term Spontaneous bacterial is confusing

2. Summary: Presents the general idea of the topic, objectives, research methods, results and conclusions, written in an objective and concise manner; and are found according to the maximum number of words per section.

Regular

Abstract is not complete

3. Introduction: Presentation of the subject, justification of the problem, objectives, hypotheses and methodological foundation, exposing the subject in an orderly and detailed manner

Regular

Not correct gram-negative, the introduction is very basic.

4. Methodology: Describes the procedure, methods and techniques used in data collection and analysis.

Good

There is no methodology

5. Ethical aspects. Does the manuscript have a paragraph on ethical aspects, where it mentions approval by the ethics committee, informed consent, and strict compliance with research ethics?

Yes

6. Results: They are presented adequately and it is not redundant with tables or graphs shown.

Regular

No results

7. Discussion: They present a level of critical analysis in correspondence with the problem presented. Purposes of the article, scope, support theory and proposed methodological design.

Regular

Misuse of bibliographical citations is made, for example, in a single idea, 1-40 is cited

8. Conclusions: Presents the author's inferences and teachings in relation to the investigated topic, it must correspond to the objectives of the study.

Regular

Tthere is no conclusion

9. References. Quality of bibliographic references and if they are in accordance with the Vancouver format.

Regular

The 40 references are not justified

10. Redaction. Is the manuscript correctly written? Does it contain any spelling or grammar mistakes?

Acceptable

11. Contributions. What are the main weaknesses of the manuscript and how the author can do to improve it

The structure of the document, the 40 references are not justified

---

Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Decline Submission

1. Relevance of the title to the content of the article

Poor

I do not consider that due to the length and approach it can be considered a systematic review of the bibliography

2. Summary: Presents the general idea of the topic, objectives, research methods, results and conclusions, written in an objective and concise manner; and are found according to the maximum number of words per section.

Poor

The abstract is a line and a half, I think it should be expanded with more data

3. Introduction: Presentation of the subject, justification of the problem, objectives, hypotheses and methodological foundation, exposing the subject in an orderly and detailed manner

Poor

The introduction is 4 lines. It does not include any bibliographical reference. It does not explain the methodology.

4. Methodology: Describes the procedure, methods and techniques used in data collection and analysis.

Poor

Remarks

Non-existent

5. Ethical aspects. Does the manuscript have a paragraph on ethical aspects, where it mentions approval by the ethics committee, informed consent, and strict compliance with research ethics?

No

6. Results: They are presented adequately and it is not redundant with tables or graphs shown.

Poor

Few data of the clinical case are exposed

Does not include any images or graphics.

Does not explain medical or surgical history developed

It does not expose all the necessary laboratory data.

Does not explain the patient's temporal history correctly

7. Discussion: They present a level of critical analysis in correspondence with the problem presented. Purposes of the article, scope, support theory and proposed methodological design.

Regular

A much broader and more complete discussion should be made in its entirety.

It would be interesting to do it according to sections

8. Conclusions: Presents the author's inferences and teachings in relation to the investigated topic, it must correspond to the objectives of the study.

Poor

Non-existent

9. References. Quality of bibliographic references and if they are in accordance with the Vancouver format.

Good

Well developed according to international nomenclature

Number according to clinical case

10. Redaction. Is the manuscript correctly written? Does it contain any spelling or grammar mistakes?

Needs some language corrections

11. Contributions. What are the main weaknesses of the manuscript and how the author can do to improve it

Already explained during the previous sections

Reviewer C:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

1. Relevance of the title to the content of the article

Regular

A suggestion for the title would be: "Spontaneous bacterial peritonitis caused by Listeria monocytogenes: case report and literautre review."

Besides that, I think the title is informative and gives the reader the idea of what is the main information about the paper.

2. Summary: Presents the general idea of the topic, objectives, research methods, results and conclusions, written in an objective and concise manner; and are found according to the maximum number of words per section.

Poor

Please, rewrite the abstract, give the reader the main aspects about the case and some information about the occurence of spontaneous peritonitis caused by L. monocytogenes.

3. Introduction: Presentation of the subject, justification of the problem, objectives, hypotheses and methodological foundation, exposing the subject in an orderly and detailed manner

Poor

Although the paper seems like a short communication about the occurence of spontaneous peritonitis caused by L. monocytogenes, the introduction lacks some valuable informations about the bacteria and the disease discussed in the case report. In the title is written that you performed a literature review, but I can't find it in the text.

With that said, I think you could add more informations about SBP, about L. monocytogens, about clinical course and treatmen. You could add information abou the rate of occurence of this condition and outcome.

4. Methodology: Describes the procedure, methods and techniques used in data collection and analysis.

Poor

The case description is poor, with few details about the course of the disease.

1) Was she treating the cancer?

2) If yes, for how long?

3) How much fluid did you recoverd from the paracentesis?

4) What was the aspect of the fluid?

5) For how long was she in the hospital before death?

6) Was the peritonitis the cause of the death?

5. Ethical aspects. Does the manuscript have a paragraph on ethical aspects, where it mentions approval by the ethics committee, informed consent, and strict compliance with research ethics?

No

6. Results: They are presented adequately and it is not redundant with tables or graphs shown.

Poor

In concern of the case report, please read the comments about methodolgy.

I really miss the literature review, since it is written in the title that it would be present.

7. Discussion: They present a level of critical analysis in correspondence with the problem presented. Purposes of the article, scope, support theory and proposed methodological design.

Poor

The discussion feels more like an introduction than a proper discussion. There is no critical analysis in correspondence with the problem presented.

8. Conclusions: Presents the author's inferences and teachings in relation to the investigated topic, it must correspond to the objectives of the study.

Poor

The conclusion can be improved.

9. References. Quality of bibliographic references and if they are in accordance with the Vancouver format.

Regular

10. Redaction. Is the manuscript correctly written? Does it contain any spelling or grammar mistakes?

Requires a thorough assessment of grammar and spelling

11. Contributions. What are the main weaknesses of the manuscript and how the author can do to improve it

Adding a proper literature review and more information about the condition could improve the paper.

Cosenza, February 25, 2023

To the Editor-in-Chief
Microbes, Infection and Chemotherapy

Dear Editor-in-Chief,
Please find enclosed a complete electronic copy of the revised version of our original, short submission entitled: "**Spontaneous bacterial peritonitis by *Listeria monocytogenes*. A rare case and literautre review**".

The authors should like to submit their revised work to the valuable attention of the Journal "**Microbes, Infection and Chemotherapy**", as a "**Clinical Cases**".

All authors have made substantial contributions to the revision of the manuscript and they all approved the final version. The authors have followed all the requests and indications of the three reviewers, improving the abstract, the case report and the discussion; it has been drastically reduced the bibliography. We hope to have success with this revised version as requested by the reviewers and look forward to your kind feedback. Should any problem arise, please feel free to contact us at your convenience.

Best Regards

Dr. Antonio Mastroianni, M.D.

Correspondence Author:
Dr. Antonio Mastroianni,
Infectious & Tropical Diseases Unit
"Annunziata" Hub Hospital
Azienda Ospedaliera di Cosenza
Viale della Repubblica s.n.c.
87100 Cosenza, Italy
Telephone: +39 0984 68.18.33; Mobile: +39 349-54.44.330
e-mail: antoniomastroianni@yahoo.it