

Kelsey Messerschmidt's Review

Thank you for the opportunity to review the case report of “Chlamydia trachomatis infection in early neonatal period.”

Abstract:

1. The abstract is very short and lacking detail. I would recommend adding information relative to the significance of the study and the type of study.
2. The wording of the ‘results’ section of the abstract is confusing, particularly in the first two sentences attempting to distinguish the *C. trachomatis* and *C. trachomatis/cytomegalovirus* infections.
3. ‘Conclusion’ was used in the abstract as a section heading but was not in the article; ‘discussion’ was. I would recommend being consistent for clarity of reading.

Background:

1. Throughout the article, the in-text citation format was inconsistent.
2. In the first paragraph of the ‘background’, it was stated that “chlamydial infections still have been recognized as a major public health problem throughout the world including Japan.” This statement is weak and ineffective. I recommend the addition of quantitative data describing the problem to strengthen the significance of the study.
3. When stating the results of the Gencay and colleagues study, quantitative data would strengthen the claim of “their results strongly suggest” as well.

Methods:

1. I would like more descriptive information in the ‘Patients’ subsection of the Methods, particularly which years “annually 150-200 neonates were admitted to the neonatal intensive care unit (NICU)...” refers to. Was it the January 1995 to December 2001 timeframe mentioned after?
2. The majority of the ‘Patients’ subsection added little value to the understanding of the study and would have better been presented by referring to ‘Table 1’ instead of listing the attributes of the cases.
3. The last two paragraphs of the ‘Patients’ subsection seem better fit for the ‘Results’ section. I would consider revising.

Results:

1. Through the article, the terms “infants” and “neonates” are used interchangeably. I recommend staying consistent with the terms that you are using to describe cases. “Infant” and “neonate” do not refer to the same age group and the use a both creates confusion for the reader.
2. The second sentence of the section, “There were more female” is misplaced, poorly worded, and irrelevant without context.
3. Clarification on how you defined “success” in reference to ‘treatment with ampicillin and amikacin’ would be informative.

Discussion:

1. The last sentence of the first paragraph is missing a “.”. It should read, “*C. trachomatis* may lead to abortion through excessive maternal immunogenic reaction to its heat shock protein 60 antigen.”
2. I’m confused as to why there is a citation referring to the interest in preterm infants, in the third paragraph, when only 1 case in this study is considered preterm. What is its relevance to this case report?
3. In the sixth paragraph, I really appreciated last statement comparing culture and PCR. Following it though, I was expecting some sort of recommendation to what may work best in low prevalence populations, such as Japan.
4. I would omit “one infant was born by cesarean section” in the seventh paragraph. It is misplaced.

Overall Recommendation: Reject