



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 73959

Title: Scar-Centered Dilation in the Treatment of Large Keloids

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06074564

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Finland

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-01-10

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-01-15 08:51

Reviewer performed review: 2022-01-28 10:14

Review time: 13 Days and 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 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	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous



**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

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This study introduces the treatment of 9 keloid, which was performed through a keloid incision and with a custom expander embedded. After full expansion, the keloid was directly resected using a linear suture, which avoids new surgical incisions and scars and can successfully remove large-area keloids. The treatment is effective, providing new insights and strategies for the treatment of similar large-area keloid and hypertrophic scar cases in the future. It's an interesting study; however, I have the following questions and comments: 1. According to your description, nine patients were enrolled in the study, but why is it written in the Abstract "performed 10 surgeries on patients with keloids" on Page 1, Line 20? 2. The format of references should be modified. I also recommend that the manuscript can be published after polishing the English.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 73959

Title: Scar-Centered Dilation in the Treatment of Large Keloids

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06074569

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Spain

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-01-10

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-01-15 08:51

Reviewer performed review: 2022-01-28 10:15

Review time: 13 Days and 1 Hour

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
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	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous



**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

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [**Y**] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you for giving us the precious opportunity for reading an interesting report. In general, this is a scientifically sound and useful Study examining the treatment of keloids, it was observed that the following sequence of procedures can successfully remove large keloids and achieve a good curative effect: scar incision, embedding of a custom expander, skin expansion to remove the keloid, formation of a single linear suture incision, and then postoperative radiotherapy. However, in my view, this manuscript is a little bit less case as a retrospective study and there is too little in the results section; rather, this study is more like a case report with nine cases. All cases are very typical and would providing new insights and strategies for the treatment of similar large-area keloid and hypertrophic scar cases in the future.