



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 83696

**Title:** Atypical Progress of Frozen Shoulder after COVID-19 Vaccination: Case Report

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 06284599

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Chief Physician

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

**Author's Country/Territory:** South Korea

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-02-05

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-02-06 02:20

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-02-12 02:06

**Review time:** 5 Days and 23 Hours

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 Grade E: Do not publish |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



# 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>

|  |   |
|--|---|
| 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<br><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<br><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)<br><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

In the case report , the authors describe a patient with frozen shoulder after COVID-19 Vaccination . The occurrence of frozen shoulder has strong correlation with vaccination, which is consistent with clinical diagnosis . But this case is not very rare.



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 83696

**Title:** Atypical Progress of Frozen Shoulder after COVID-19 Vaccination: Case Report

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 02475008

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

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

**Author's Country/Territory:** South Korea

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-02-05

**Reviewer chosen by:** Geng-Long Liu

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-03-02 07:52

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-03-02 17:59

**Review time:** 10 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<br><input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish |
| <b>Novelty of this manuscript</b>                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair<br><input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty   |
| <b>Creativity or innovation of this manuscript</b> | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair<br><input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation                                |



|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b> | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair<br><input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance   |
| <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)<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input 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   |

**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

The clinical case described in the manuscript submitted to me for review is well presented from a clinical point of view. I have a few considerations to make: 1. The type of vaccine used is not specified: AstraZeneca, Pfizer, Moderna, others? 2. line 181: “All laboratory test results were in the normal range”: it is preferable “All laboratory test results were within the reference values” 3. Are similar phenomena known in subjects vaccinated on the same day with the same vaccine and the same lot?