

Association of nailfold capillaroscopic findings with clinical features in patients with systemic sclerosis

Haque T *et al.* (tajkia59dmc@gmail.com)

Technical review

Reviewer A information			
Date review assigned	14-Mar-24	Date review completed	15-Mar-24
Reviewer name	Rijwan Bhuiyan	Do you have any conflict of interest with the author/s?	No
ORCID	0000-0003-0005-8889	Do you wish to be disclosed to the author?	Yes
Reviewer's comments (15-Mar-24)		Score [out of 10]	Author's response (16-Mar-24) [Please write a response if score is less than 6. You must change the manuscript as per your response. Mention line numbers.]
1.	How would you rate the originality and depth of the manuscript?	8	-
2.	Is the manuscript written in a scholarly manner?	8	-
3.	Does the manuscript have the potential to make a valuable contribution to the world of knowledge?	7	-
4.	Does the manuscript meet ethical standards?	10	-
1. Highlight should reflect the key findings of the study or selling points of the article. Please revise it.			1. The highlight is revised (Page 3, line 72-76)
2. Line 63 & 64: Revise the conclusion focusing the major findings rather than any recommendation.			2. The conclusion is being revised accordingly (Page 2, line 62-64).
3. Line 114: "Some researchers failed" Seems inappropriate. May present like "Some researchers did not find/ identified".			3. The sentence was rewritten (Page 4, line 112)
4. Please explain from where and in which process the patient were enrolled. Is it from OPD/IPD? Randomly or purposively?			4. The procedure was explained (Page 5, line 133-135).
5. Line 183, 184: Mention the quantitative and categorical variables in bracket.			5. Mentioned within bracket (Page 7, line 187-190).
6. Line 187: Would better if revised like: "Student's t test or Mann-Whitney U test (for not normal distribution)". Such style of writing could help new researcher.			6. All are revised accordingly (Page 7, line 191; Page 8, line 192)
7. Line 194 & 197: Maintain same pattern of writing mean (standard deviation). Better to remove "±".			7. Maintained (Page 8, line 199)
8. Line 193 – 208: Could reduce the text and number by mentioning the major findings with referring the respective Table.			8. The text is reduced (Page 8, line 201)
9. Line 52, 103, 136 144, 146, 150. : Provide full form of HRCT, ECG, PC, ACR/EULAR, EULAR, MAS and MAI. Line 131: As EULAR came first in line 103, so provide cronym here.			9. The full forms are given (Page 6, lines 145,147,153; Page 5, lines 129,136; Page 4, lines 101-102).
10. Revise the author contribution as per journal's guidelines.			10. Revised (Page 12, lines 291-295)
Reviewer's Recommendation		Revisions Required	

Reviewer B information			
Date review assigned	14-Mar-24	Date review completed	15-Mar-24
Reviewer name	Ferdous Hakim	Do you have any conflict of interest with the author/s?	No
ORCID	0000-0003-2376-3978	Do you wish to be disclosed to the author?	Yes
Reviewer's comments (15-Mar-24)		Author's response (16-Mar-24)	
A very tidy work that needs no editing.		-	
Reviewer's Recommendation	Accepted		

Final decision of the Editor (17-Mar-24)	ACCEPT We shall edit the manuscript soon for your concurrence.
---	--