

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 83497

Title: Misdiagnosis of Scalp Angiosarcoma: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03908850

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: BSc, MD

Professional title: Doctor, Research Scientist, Staff Physician, Surgeon, Surgical Oncologist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Russia

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-01-27

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-02-19 19:47

Reviewer performed review: 2023-02-19 19:51

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you for the possibility to review the manuscript titled: "Misdiagnosis of Scalp Angiosarcoma: a case report". The manuscript is interesting, well-illustrated and easy to read. The main goals and ideas and presented in a clear fashion. There are only one minor recommendations: -Please review he language of the manuscript, there are minor type errors in the text. The overall quality of the review is high. Please take into account the recommendations in the spirit of improving the quality of the submission.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 83497

Title: Misdiagnosis of Scalp Angiosarcoma: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05429012

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Doctor, Research Scientist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Jordan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-01-27

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-02-26 06:06

Reviewer performed review: 2023-03-07 02:29

Review time: 8 Days and 20 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

the authors presented a rare case under difficult conditions. Although, the manuscript is good, the following points should be taken into consideration: - It is not clear if the malignancy presented in this study came before the injury, or after it. - Parts of the discussion part should be in the introduction. - Figures need to be more explainable through the use of arrows and comments. - Some language issues have to be addressed. - I suggest, but this is optional, to conduct a clinicopathological comparison between the perspectives of the lesion as inflammatory and malignancy.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 83497

Title: Misdiagnosis of Scalp Angiosarcoma: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 00013050

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: DSc, MD, MSc

Professional title: Full Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Taiwan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-01-27

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-02-26 04:24

Reviewer performed review: 2023-03-08 17:11

Review time: 10 Days and 12 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript does not contain new concepts, hypotheses, mechanistic information, or therapeutic information, but provides information and suggestions on diagnosis. My specific comments are itemized below:

- 1 Title. The title reflects the main subject of the manuscript.
- 2 Abstract. The abstract summarizes and reflects the work described in the manuscript.
- 3 Key Words. The key words reflect the focus of the manuscript, but what does “physical factors” mean?
- 4 Background. The manuscript satisfactorily describes the background, present status and significance of the study.
- 5 Methods. The manuscript does not have this section.
- 6 Results. What is the cause of death?
- 7 Discussion.
 - (1) What does it mean by “physical factors should be used” in the Abstract?
 - (2) A suggestion is “pathological examination should be performed for refractory ulcers of the scalp”; why not refractory ulcers of other part of the skin?
 - (3) How was the suggestion “physical factors should be used with caution before the diagnosis is clear” reached? Delay in proper treatment or something else? Please clarify.
- 8 Illustrations and tables. The quality of figures is satisfactory.
- 9 Biostatistics. The manuscript did not use statistical methods.
- 10 Units. The manuscript meets the requirements of use of SI



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

units, but the description “neutrophil percentage: 0.78 (reference value: 0.20-0.75)” is not appropriate. 11 References. The use of references is satisfactory. 12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. The organization and presentation of the manuscript is satisfactory but the section 2. Consent for publication can be placed together with other ethical statements. 13 Research methods and reporting. Authors have prepared their manuscripts according to BPG’s standards for manuscript type. 14 Ethics statements. The manuscript meets the requirements of ethics, but the statement “the Department of Ethics Committee of the First Hospital of Jilin University approved the study” should not be in a different font or in red. By the way, “Department of Ethics Committee” is weird; please confirm.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 83497

Title: Misdiagnosis of Scalp Angiosarcoma: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05429012

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Doctor, Research Scientist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Jordan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-01-27

Reviewer chosen by: Xiao-Fang Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-03-26 06:18

Reviewer performed review: 2023-03-26 06:39

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

thanks for the authors for making the corrections as required