# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*  
**Manuscript NO:** 71159  
**Title:** Daptomycin and linezolid for severe MRSA Psoas abscess and bacteremia: a case report and review of the literature  
**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed  
**Peer-review model:** Single blind  
**Reviewer’s code:** 02446627  
**Position:** Editorial Board  
**Academic degree:** FACP, MD, MPhil  
**Professional title:** Full Professor  
**Reviewer’s Country/Territory:** United States  
**Author’s Country/Territory:** China  
**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-08-31  
**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique  
**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-09-08 23:12  
**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-09-10 22:55  
**Review time:** 1 Day 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Grade E: Do not publish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>
</tbody>
</table>
SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Nice case. Please see the edits as track changes in the manuscript. I would also discuss the omadacycline, which has been approved for the Skin and skin structure infection for MRSA and has good data. That also should be the part of the discussion.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Firstly, thank you for opportunity to review very interested article. 1. The title reflect the main subject about treatment with daptomycin and linezolid for severe MRSA infection, title was clear and easy to understand. 2. The abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript. 3. The key words reflect the focus of the manuscript. 4. The manuscript adequately describe the background, present status, and significance of the study. The authors explain MRSA infection with vancomycin (first line drug). In this study show benefit of combined daptomycin and linezolid. 5. The manuscript describe methods in adequate detail, study subjects were clear, with demonstrate IRB number or text to human ethics consideration. 6. The research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study. 7. The manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly, and logically. 8. Tables and figures sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents. 9. The manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics. 10. The manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections. Due to in this case use multiple antibiotic durgs, I suggested the authors add figure or timeline in antibiotic used, it's make this study more interested.