

Review of: "Overwhelming Post-Splenectomy Bacteremia Due to Streptococcus bovis Group Organisms: Report of Three Cases and Review of the Literature"

Luca Galassi

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I have had the opportunity to review the article titled "Overwhelming Post-Splenectomy Bacteremia Due to Streptococcus bovis Group Organisms: Report of Three Cases and Review of the Literature".

Overall, I think that potentially the work could contribute significantly to the field.

While the authors have undertaken a commendable effort to consolidate existing knowledge and present a comprehensive overview, it is my opinion that the manuscript requires major revisions across all sections to enhance its clarity, depth, and scientific rigor.

Introduction:

The introduction fails to provide a clear and concise background on the subject, making it challenging for readers unfamiliar with the topic to grasp the significance of the study. There is a lack of contextualization, and the objectives of the study are not explicitly stated. A comprehensive revision is needed to articulate the research gap, better define the research questions, and establish a strong rationale for the investigation.

Materials and Methods:

The materials and methods section is quite well-written; the authors included a description of data collection and statistical analyses. However, it lacks some necessary details about statistical analyses. Additionally, ethical considerations and potential biases should be addressed to ensure the robustness of the research methodology.

Results:

The presentation of results lacks clarity and coherence. Case reports are poorly explained, making it difficult to interpret the data. The authors should consider reorganizing the results section, providing detailed explanations, and standardizing the case presentations of each patient. Additionally, any unexpected findings or limitations should be highlighted to contribute to the scientific discourse.

Discussion:

The discussion section lacks depth and critical analysis. The authors need to go beyond summarizing the results and delve into the implications of their findings, relating them to the existing literature. A more thorough exploration of

alternative explanations, potential sources of error, and the broader implications of the study is necessary. It is essential to highlight the novelty of the research and its contribution to the field, addressing any limitations and suggesting avenues for future research.

Conclusions:

The conclusion is brief and fails to provide a robust synthesis of the key findings. The authors should reiterate the main contributions of the study, discuss their broader implications, and tie them back to the initial research questions. Suggestions for practical applications and potential areas for further investigation should also be included.