

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Neurology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJORRIN_98741
Title of the Manuscript:	A CASE OF LISTERIA MONOCYTOGENES MENINGITIS IN AN ELDERLY FEMALE COMPLICATED BY INTRACEREBRAL HEMORRHAGE AND HYDROCEPHALUS
Type of the Article	Case report

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajorin.com/index.php/AJORRIN/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community. I think this argument is important because <i>Listeria monocytogenes</i> is a common bacterial pathogen that can easily ingested through infected food. In new-borns, immunocompromised patients, older adults and pregnant women, <i>L. monocytogenes</i> might cause invasive diseases such as meningitis, meningoencephalitis, and bacteraemia. Without immediate treatment, the disease can quickly become life-threatening (up to 30% mortality). Unfortunately, <i>L. monocytogenes</i> meningitis is not always easily to diagnose.</p> <p>Therefore, publications of case reports are important as it increases knowledge about this disease. Yes, the title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive. However, the case report is not mentioned at all. The present abstract is more reminiscent of an introduction. Instead, an abstract, should be a short summary of the paper. Therefore, the case report must be mentioned in the present abstract, while other information might be deleted.</p> <p>The subsections and structure of the paper are correct; however, the contents do not always correspond to the individual sections. As already mentioned under point 3, the present ABSTRACT is not a clear summary of the paper (the case report is completely missing!). In addition, the INTRODUCTION is far too short. Several information about <i>L. monocytogenes</i> meningitis are missing. For example, its bacterial tropism to the central nervous system and shortly, how the bacterium gets into the brain (see, for example, the paper Pagliano P, Ascione T, Boccia G, De Caro F, Esposito S. <i>Listeria monocytogenes</i> meningitis in the elderly: epidemiological, clinical and therapeutic findings. <i>Infez Med.</i> 2016 Jun 1;24(2):105-11). Also epidemiological data are missing, which would certainly be useful. The CASE REPORT is reproduced quite well, although the first information can be found already in the introduction and some information are missing. The DISCUSSION is rather short, too.</p> <p>Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct. However, as mentioned in the previous point 4., important information are missing. First of all, some general information about this disease are missing, but especially some information about the patient of the case report. For example, it is said that the patient had already been in another hospital for 1 week; then, after 8 days, the diagnosis of <i>L. monocytogenes</i> meningitis was done, and ampicillin therapy was started. Here I spontaneously ask myself whether empirical antibiotics had been given in the meantime or not? And at home was the therapy continued with ampicillin iv or orally? → So some more information should be added.</p> <p>Yes, the references are recent and largely sufficient. I imagine that the information in the article which I have mentioned above can also be found in these publications.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The quality of the English is quite okay, however, there are some spelling mistakes, for example, it is written "glass gow coma scale", which of course has to be corrected in Glasgow Coma Scale. Or another time "he" is used instead of "she". Moreover, the spaces between the words are not always correct. Furthermore, some terms are not correct; for example, "fit": it is called "generalized tonic clonic seizure". Finally, abbreviations should always be written out the first time they are used (e.g., ASOC).</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Optional/General comments	As already mentioned, some information are missing. Of course, the missing information should be reported briefly and precisely. After all, the paper should not be too detailed or too long. However, general information about <i>Listeria monocytogenes</i> meningitis would be interesting and some additional information about the patient very useful. For example, I have noticed that only in the discussion part is it mentioned that the patient was taking immunosuppressive drugs. But which ones? Also, for example, it is said the patient's first CSF was "in favour of bacterial meningitis". Why? But was at that point an antibiotic empirical therapy started? In the conclusion, the authors themselves say that "timely diagnosis and proper antibiotics administration are essential for a favourable outcome". Therefore, these information are important. And if the patient has not been given antibiotics in the meantime until the result of the culture, this should be mentioned or discussed in the paper. One more small thing: the quality of the CT images is not very good. They seem to be photos of the images. Of course, original images would be better.	
----------------------------------	---	--

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Susanne Buechner
Department, University & Country	General Hospital of Bolzano, Italy