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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
This manuscript investigated the microbiome composition in an infant underwent two episodes of NEC. Although the NEC has a multi etiology, the authors have analyzed the pathogenesis of these two episodes of NEC in a very clear and easy-to-understand approach. The information in this article is relevant and will be interesting to the neonatologist and pediatric gastroenterologists. I have some comments as follows: 1. Page 10, on the section of “history of the first episode of NEC”, why did this baby receive the epinephrine (α and β receptor), non-epinephrine (α receptor), and dobutamine (β receptor) simultaneously? The action of these inotropic agents overlaps at some extent. 2. Page 12, on the section of “final diagnosis”. The cardiogenic NEC is a special definition? If available, please adopt guidelines or expert consensus to clarify the criterion for diagnosing cardiogenic NEC. 3. After both episodes of NEC, enteral feeding was initialized with hydrolyzed formula. Why is breast milk not the first choice? 4. Aspirin, as one representative of NSAIDs group, acts by inhibiting the Cox, which could theoretically increase the risk of NEC. So, what is the role of aspirin on the pathogenesis of the second episode of NEC?
**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases  
**Manuscript NO:** 75517  
**Title:** Intestinal microbiome changes in an infant with right atrial isomerism and recurrent necrotizing enterocolitis: A case report and review of literature  
**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed  
**Peer-review model:** Single blind  
**Reviewer’s code:** 05038685  
**Position:** Peer Reviewer  
**Academic degree:** MD, PhD  
**Professional title:** Associate Chief Physician, Associate Professor, Surgeon  
**Reviewer’s Country/Territory:** China  
**Author’s Country/Territory:** Russia  
**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-02-16  
**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique  
**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-03-13 04:24  
**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-03-22 03:40  
**Review time:** 8 Days and 23 Hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific quality</th>
<th>[ ] Grade A: Excellent</th>
<th>[ ] Grade B: Very good</th>
<th>[ ] Grade C: Good</th>
<th>[ ] Grade D: Fair</th>
<th>[ ] Grade E: Do not publish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language quality</td>
<td>[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing</td>
<td>[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing</td>
<td>[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing</td>
<td>[ ] Grade D: Rejection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>[ ] Accept (High priority)</td>
<td>[ ] Accept (General priority)</td>
<td>[ ] Minor revision</td>
<td>[ ] Major revision</td>
<td>[ ] Rejection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-review</td>
<td>[ ] Yes</td>
<td>[ ] No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer-reviewer statements</td>
<td>Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous  [ ] Onymous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicts-of-Interest:</td>
<td>[ ] Yes  [Y] No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

This case report describes the dynamics of the intestinal microbiome composition in serial fecal samples of an neonate obtained before and after surgery for congenital heart disease. This is a good topic. However, as a case report, the article is a bit lengthy. Here are some suggestions:  
1. “Materials and Methods” section is not necessary for Case Report. The detection method of fecal microbiota profiles can be described in “Laboratory examinations” part. Other laboratory testing methods such as Fecal culture or Blood culture are routine and therefore do not require a detailed description of the procedure.  
2. The discussion part of this article is tedious and should be simplified. This article focuses on intestinal microbiome changes in an infant with right atrial isomerism and recurrent necrotizing enterocolitis, so the cardiopulmonary bypass (Paragraphs 11 and 12 in the Discussion) should not be discussed alone here.
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