

Review Form2

Book Name:	Medicine and Medical Research: New Perspectives
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2478
Title of the Manuscript:	A Case Report of BartonellaHenselae Infection causing Fever of Unknown Origin : Unveiling a Stealthy Pathogen
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is valuable to the scientific community because it underscores the critical role of thorough social history in diagnosing atypical infections like Cat Scratch Disease (CSD), particularly in cases of fever of unknown origin. It emphasizes the need for heightened awareness of Bartonellahenselae as a potential cause of prolonged fever and lymphadenopathy, which is often overlooked. The case report highlights the importance of timely diagnosis and intervention to prevent severe complications, urging further research into rapid diagnostic methods for Bartonella infections, especially in vulnerable populations. This focus on an often-missed pathogen significantly improves patient outcomes in clinical practice.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is suitable.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract provides a good overview of the case report, but it could be more comprehensive by including a few additional details. Here are my suggestions: 1. Expand on Clinical Manifestations: Mentioning some of the specific clinical manifestations (e.g., lymphadenopathy, mesenteric lymphadenitis) observed in this case could provide more context. 2. Highlight Diagnostic Methods: Including a brief mention of the diagnostic approach used to confirm Bartonella infection would add clarity. 3. Mention Treatment: A sentence about the treatment administered after the diagnosis would give a complete picture of the case. 4. End with Significance: Concluding with the significance of this case in advancing understanding of CSD, particularly in endemic regions, would emphasize its contribution to the scientific community.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound due to its comprehensive approach to diagnosing and managing a case of Cat Scratch Disease (CSD) caused by Bartonellahenselae. The case report effectively highlights the challenges clinicians face when encountering fever of unknown origin and underscores the importance of thorough social history in diagnosing atypical infections like CSD. The manuscript accurately describes the clinical presentation, diagnostic workup, and treatment, providing a clear, evidence-based rationale for the chosen therapeutic approach..	

Review Form2

Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The discussion is well-supported by current literature, and the manuscript emphasizes the need for further research, particularly in developing rapid diagnostic methods, which reflect a sound understanding of the disease's clinical implications.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communications, but there are a few areas where improvements could enhance clarity and readability: 1. Grammar and Punctuation: Some sentences are lengthy and could be broken down for better readability. For instance, "Cat Scratch disease caused by BartonellaHenselae, is a common infectious cause of lymphadenopathy and fever and should be considered in the differential diagnosis of patients with prolonged Fever, especially those with relevant exposure history of exposure to cats" could be simplified and made more concise. 2. Consistency in Terminology: The manuscript sometimes shifts between medical terminology and more casual language. For example, "fever of unknown origin" (FUO) should be used consistently throughout instead of sometimes just "fever". 3. Spelling and Typographical Errors: There are minor typographical errors, such as "aspect meningitis" instead of "aseptic meningitis." "BartonellaHenselae" instead of "<i>Bartonellahenselae</i>" by italics. These should be corrected to maintain professionalism. 4. Clarity and Precision: Some phrases could be more precise. For example, "the cat was seen by a vet, who told us what was expected" is vague and should be more explicit. Overall, the manuscript's content is solid, but refining the language would improve its scholarly communication quality.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript presents a well-documented case of Bartonellahenselae infection, highlighting the diagnostic challenges associated with fever of unknown origin (FUO). The detailed case presentation and discussion effectively emphasize the importance of considering atypical infections like Cat Scratch Disease, especially when traditional diagnostic approaches yield inconclusive results. While the manuscript is comprehensive and informative, minor language improvements and more consistent use of medical terminology would enhance its clarity and impact. Overall, it contributes valuable insights into the diagnosis and management of FUO in clinical practice.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kateryna Slivinska
Department, University & Country	Museum and Institute of Zoology of Polish Academy of Sciences, Poland , Schmalhausen Institute of Zoology of National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Ukraine