

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Manuscript NO:** 67498

**Title:** Eosinophilic fasciitis–progress in diagnosis and treatment: Two case reports

**Reviewer's code:** 05487696

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD, MSc

**Professional title:** Consultant Physician-Scientist, Doctor, Lecturer

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Egypt

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-06-08

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-06-08 10:18

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-06-08 13:43

**Review time:** 3 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**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

## **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

**#TITLE:** Interesting title reflecting the presented case and the main article

**#ABSTRACT:** 1) In case summary; diagnosis related points can be more concise and treatment with prognosis should appear. 2) In conclusion; "Diagnosis and differential diagnosis can be made" should be written as: Diagnosis can be reached out.

**#INTRODUCTION:** 3) Line 2: "EF is rare": redundancy 4) "Currently, the disease is generally believed to be associated with abnormalities of the immune system, and no clear diagnosis and classification criteria exist. Among the existing reported cases, an increase in eosinophils precedes the development of the characteristic skin lesions" Cite a reference here.

**CASE PRESENTATION** 5) Make a separate paragraphs for patient1 titled as (Patient1) and the same for the Patient2. 6) In patient1: the subtitle: Imaging examinations - Patient 1 should be placed above the correct paragraph. **#Discussion:**

7) Proofreading and punctuation revision is recommended > 8) Peripheral eosinophilia in both cases, should be discussed carefully. **# CONCLUSION:** 9) The authors

recommend using hormonal therapy, are they managed the presented patient hormonally?

**#REFERENCES:** Revise number 11: Why did not you put the authors names of this reference? (Rechelle Tull MD, William D Hoover III MD et al) **#**

**FIGURES** 11) Figure1 &2: Histopathology picture, type of the stains, power of magnification,.. have to be mentioned in the caption.

## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Manuscript NO:** 67498

**Title:** Eosinophilic fasciitis–progress in diagnosis and treatment: Two case reports

**Reviewer's code:** 05487696

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD, MSc

**Professional title:** Consultant Physician-Scientist, Doctor, Lecturer

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Egypt

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-06-08

**Reviewer chosen by:** Yun-Xiaojuan Wu

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-07-09 06:22

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-07-09 06:38

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Review comments are followed