

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 83113

Title: Eosinophilic fasciitis difficult to differentiate from scleroderma: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03477847

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Turkey

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-01-08

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-01-22 13:47

Reviewer performed review: 2023-01-31 20:06

Review time: 9 Days and 6 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 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 type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" 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

Dear AUTHORS, You can find my comments below. 1. The manuscript should be reviewed for spelling mistakes. 2. It is said that there is an English certificate, but a form that does not belong to an institution has been uploaded. Details should be shared about whether there is a person at a level that can issue a certificate about the person who signed this letter or this certificate should be obtained from an institution. 3. The reference units in the laboratory values section are not written in the article, they should be added. 4. The names of the hospitals to which the patient applied were given before, but I think that the hospital name should not be given ethically, as it will be perceived as disparaging these hospitals. The other hospital names should be removed from the article. 5. It is said that the patient was given hormone therapy, but which hormone was not mentioned. Details about hormone therapy should be given. 6. In the literature, drug-induced EF is mentioned. Is there a factor that they think may be involved in the etiology of this patient? for example, the drugs he used for diabetes. this description can be added to the manuscript. Kind Regards

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 83113

Title: Eosinophilic fasciitis difficult to differentiate from scleroderma: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02519158

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: DSc, PharmD, PhD

Professional title: Assistant Lecturer, Lecturer, Teaching Assistant

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Poland

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-01-08

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-02-08 10:16

Reviewer performed review: 2023-02-16 18:49

Review time: 8 Days and 8 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input 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

This is a very interesting case report which presents a new original aspect of scleroderma diagnostics. It may be a valuable source of knowledge for all clinicians who in their practice meet problems of scleroderma differentiation from other diseases. The article is well designed and written and case is described in detail. For these reasons, I recommend this article for high priority publication.