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Which of the following best describes what type of case report this is?: Unexpected or unusual presentations of a disease

Has the case been reported coherently?: Yes

Is the case report authentic?: Yes

Is the case report ethical?: Yes

Is there any missing information that you think must be added before publication?: Yes

Is this case worth reporting?: Yes

Is the case report persuasive?: Yes

Does the case report have explanatory value?: Yes

Does the case report have diagnostic value?: Yes

Will the case report make a difference to clinical practice?: Yes

Is the anonymity of the patient protected?: Yes

Comments to authors:

Hayashida K, Murakami C and Fujioka M report a case of tetanus after replantation of the amputated finger.

General comments

Tetanus is one of the concerned infectious diseases in the case of direct soil contact is highly considered. This case is applicable of not absolute but relative risk of tetanus as bot middle finger is amputated and ring finger is open fractured. This manuscript warns this may occur in every clinical setting and may be beneficial to readers to be reminded.

The prophylactic effects of tetanus toxoid and/or human anti-tetanus immunoglobulin (TIG) at the very beginning of the treatment are not clarified.
Apparent clinical onset of tetanus is at 21 day after the injury and 6 days after the secondary flap surgery and this clinical time-course should be further discussed more in details, including local sings and manifestations of the middle fingers.

How would the authors determine the “middle” finger the focal site of tetanus but ring finger?

Specific comments

In “Abstract”, “during inpatient treatment” should be corrected to “during hospitalization”.

In “Introduction”, line 67, “after trauma of the hand” should be corrected to “after trauma of the fingers”.

In “Case presentation”, line 74 and 75, “No tetanus toxoid was injected because there was no soil contamination”, the relevant treatment criteria in the authors” institute should be inserted.

In “Case presentation”, line 105, final outcome after healing at 8 weeks had better be included.

In “Discussion”, line 114, did the authors measure this patient’s “basic immunity”? 

In “Discussion”, line 118, to support this line, the condition of the ring finger and clinical course of the ring finger should be clarified in the “Case presentation” section.

In “Discussion”, line 123 to 127, when prophylaxis of toxoid and human anti-tetanus immunoglobulin (TIG) are administered at the very first day, what clinical course is expected?

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published