

Review Form2

Book Name:	Disease and Health Research: New Insights
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2359
Title of the Manuscript:	Meningoencephalitis due to Listeria monocytogenes in a Young Immunocompetent Patient: Case Report with Literature Review
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 presents an interesting and significant case of Listeria monocytogenes meningoencephalitis in a young, immunocompetent adult, a rare occurrence that challenges the traditional understanding of L. monocytogenes infections. Typically seen in immunocompromised individuals, newborns, and the elderly, this case highlights the need for the scientific community to consider atypical presentations in healthy individuals without classic risk factors. I appreciate the manuscript's contribution because it broadens the scope of potential differential diagnoses for meningoencephalitis and emphasizes the importance of early identification and intervention, even in cases that deviate from the norm. However, the manuscript could benefit from a deeper discussion of the potential mechanisms leading to this rare presentation.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title, "Meningoencephalitis due to Listeria monocytogenes in a Young Immunocompetent Patient: Case Report with Literature Review," is generally suitable as it effectively conveys the key elements of the manuscript: the focus on a rare case of L. monocytogenes meningoencephalitis in a young, immunocompetent patient along with a literature review. However, it could be slightly refined for clarity and emphasis. An alternative title could be: "Rare Case of Meningoencephalitis by Listeria monocytogenes in a Young Immunocompetent Adult: Case Report and Literature Review"	
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 is generally comprehensive, covering key points such as the rarity of Listeria monocytogenes infection in immunocompetent individuals, a brief case description, and the relevance of considering this pathogen in atypical presentations. However, some improvements can be made to enhance clarity and focus. Here are my suggestions: - Structure: Abstracts generally include a background, case description, and conclusion. Currently, the abstract lacks clear differentiation between these sections -	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript structure is generally appropriate for a case report with a literature review. However, there are some areas where the organization, subsections, and flow can be improved for clarity and coherence. Introduction: The historical background of L. monocytogenes is informative but should be more concise. Focus on the relevant aspects of its epidemiology and risk factors related to human infections, especially in immunocompetent patients. Clinical Case: The clinical case is well-structured and includes key details. However, ensure that diagnostic findings (e.g., Biochemical data, imaging findings) are explicitly included.It would be helpful to include the timeline of clinical events in a clear sequence: onset, progression, diagnostics, interventions, and outcome.	

Review Form2

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 minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound for several reasons. Firstly, it addresses a rare and clinically significant scenario: meningoencephalitis due to <i>Listeria monocytogenes</i> in an immunocompetent patient, which provides valuable insight into an atypical presentation of the disease. The case report is well-supported by a comprehensive review of the literature, which highlights similar cases and emphasizes the uniqueness of this occurrence. Additionally, the manuscript effectively discusses relevant clinical, diagnostic, and therapeutic aspects, providing a clear narrative that aligns with current scientific knowledge. The inclusion of appropriate references further strengthens the scientific foundation and credibility of the report, making it a useful contribution to the field.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are adequate and up-to-date	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Overall, this article is mostly suitable for scholarly communication, but there are several areas where improvements could enhance clarity and precision. Below are some of the weak language points: Grammar and Punctuation Issues: There are several instances of incorrect punctuation usage, particularly with semicolons and commas. For example, in the abstract: "This case is exceptional, since it occurred in an individual outside the classic age group, in addition to not having risk factors, which is why it should be considered an atypical causal agent." The use of commas could be more concise, and the sentence structure could be refined for better readability. Redundancy and Word Choice: Some parts of the text are repetitive or use unnecessary words. For instance, in the clinical case description, phrases like "without comorbidities, without history of chronic diseases, without history of immunocompromise" could be consolidated for a smoother flow. Inconsistency in Terminology: The manuscript sometimes uses variations of the same terms interchangeably, which may confuse readers. For example, "immunocompetent" and "without immunocompromise" are both used but should be consistent. Ambiguities and Vague Phrasing: Certain sentences are unclear or overly complex, such as "Given a condition compatible with bacterial neuroinfection, it was decided to start empirical treatment." It is better to specify who made the decision and under what rationale.	
Optional/General comments	Strengths: The article addresses a significant and rare clinical presentation—<i>Listeria monocytogenes</i> meningoencephalitis in an immunocompetent young adult—which adds valuable knowledge to the field. Such cases are underrepresented in medical literature. Weaknesses: Language and Grammar: The manuscript contains several grammatical errors, awkward sentence structures, and inconsistencies in terminology. Phrases like “without immunocompromise” and "without history of immunocompromise" could be streamlined to improve readability Suggestions for Improvement: - Improve the language by revising the manuscript for grammatical accuracy and more fluid sentence structures. - Expand the discussion to include a more in-depth exploration of why certain patients without typical risk factors might still be susceptible to <i>L. monocytogenes</i> infection.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer’s comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Azad Mohammed Taher Salih
Department, University & Country	Iraq