

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 68471

Title: Tigecycline sclerotherapy for recurrent pseudotumor in aseptic lymphocyte-dominant vasculitis-associated lesion after metal-on-metal total hip arthroplasty: A case report

Reviewer's code: 05948289

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Chief Physician, Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Taiwan

Manuscript submission date: 2021-06-02

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-06-16 21:16

Reviewer performed review: 2021-06-21 21:14

Review time: 4 Days and 23 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 Grade E: Do not publish
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The present manuscript described a case report of locally injected an infusion of tige cycline sclerotherapy for treating the pseudotumor successfully. The findings indicated that tige cycline sclerotherapy is safe and effective in managing recurrent pseudotumor after revision non-MoM THA in ALVAL cases. The mechanism of tige cycline sclerotherapy is also briefly discussed and provides an option for the treatment of similar diseases. This study is well designed, executed and presented. However, the authors seem to have used the wrong photos C and F in Fig 1, which appear to be photos of the knee. There are a few major issues that should be addressed by the authors before consideration for publication: 1. In line 6, the symbols"." is not necessary. 2. In case summary, the revision surgery was performed before or after the pathological diagnosis or at the same time? It's better to describe the treatment in chronological order. 3. In line 65-67, the keywords should be limited in 5. 4. Since the first appearance of ARMD has used the full name, there is no need to write the full name when it appears later in the body text. So does ALVAL. 5. "total hip arthroplasty" can be used in its abbreviated form "THA" in line 83,92,99 et al. 6. The authors seem to have used the wrong photos C and F in Fig 1, which appear to be photos of the knee. 7. In Fig 2, it is advisable for the authors to use MRI images of the same sequence to facilitate the reader's comparison, e.g. C. 8. It is advisable for authors to update some recently published references.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 68471

Title: Tigecycline sclerotherapy for recurrent pseudotumor in aseptic lymphocyte-dominant vasculitis-associated lesion after metal-on-metal total hip arthroplasty: A case report

Reviewer's code: 05948289

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Chief Physician, Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Taiwan

Manuscript submission date: 2021-06-02

Reviewer chosen by: Han Zhang (Online Science Editor)

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-07-16 21:04

Reviewer performed review: 2021-07-17 08:09

Review time: 11 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
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

The author has responded accurately and appropriately to the questions posed by the reviewer in the article, I have no further questions. Recommended for publication.