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Reviewer's report:

1. Do you believe the case report is authentic?
   Yes

2. Do you have any ethical concerns? Please consider if local Institutional Review Board approval or ethical approval was obtained (if appropriate) and if the patient (or their parent or guardian in the case of children under 18) gave written, informed consent to publish this case and any accompanying images. A statement to this effect should appear in the manuscript.
   Comments: No ethical concerns.

3. Does the Introduction explain the relevance of the case to the medical literature?
   No. This was commented upon in the original submission for this paper and has not been adequately addressed.

4. Does the article report the following information? Where information is missing, please specify.
   a. The relevant patient information, including:
      - De-identified demographic information (age, gender, ethnicity)
      - Main symptoms of the patient
      - Medical, family and psychosocial history
      - Relevant past interventions and their outcomes

   b. The relevant physical examination findings

   c. Important dates and times in this case (if appropriate, organized as a timeline via a figure or table); if specific dates could lead to patient identification, consider including time relevant to initial presentation, i.e. initial presentation at T = 0, follow up at T = 1 month.

   d. Diagnostic assessments, including:
      - Diagnostic methods
      - Challenges (e.g., financial, language/cultural)
      - Reasoning and prognostic characteristics (e.g., staging), where applicable
e. Types and mechanism of intervention

f. A summary of the clinical course of all follow-up visits

Comments: Yes. Previously, important dates were missing but have now been provided.

5. Is the interpretation (discussion and conclusion) well balanced and supported by the case presented?
Comments: See additional comments.

6. Is the anonymity of the patient protected? Please consider any identifying information in images such as facial features or nametags, whether the patient is named etc. If not, please detail below.
Yes

7. Is the Abstract representative of the case presented?
Comments: Yes.

8. Does the case represent a useful contribution to the medical literature?
Comments: With more revisions, yes.

9. Additional comments for the author(s)?
Numerous times in the resubmitted article, it states that C. perfringens sepsis should be considered in patients presenting with liver damage "after chemotherapy." Since the article is focusing on C. perfringens sepsis following TACE, the phrase "after chemotherapy" is over-stating the point and should be replaced by "after chemo-embolic therapy."

The previous recommendation to focus on the literature review has not been adequately addressed. To be more specific, in order for the article to properly present itself as a meaningful contribution to medical literature, a review of the literature regarding C. perfringens sepsis following TACE should be clearly stated as a goal of the article in the introduction. It is noted that median values of various chemistry tests were included (inclusion of the mean had been suggested in the prior review). However, as the discussion is currently written, it is unclear what the median values represent. It seems to represent a change in laboratory values prior to development of hemolysis and after development of hemolysis. Perhaps presenting the change in laboratory values in a table format might make the information more clear.

On page 8, near line 28, it is mentioned that liver function enzyme levels were elevated compared with that of the previous report. Which report is being referred to?
**Level of interest**  
Please indicate how interesting you found the manuscript:  

An article of limited interest

**Quality of written English**  
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:  

Needs some language corrections before being published

**Declaration of competing interests**  
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?
If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal

Were you mentored through this peer review?

No