



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 105331

Title: Letter to the editor: Immunoglobulin G4-related spinal pachymeningitis: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer’s code: 08436129

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree and professional title: MD, Senior Researcher

Reviewer’s Country/Territory: Pakistan

Author’s Country/Territory: Morocco

Manuscript submission date: 2025-01-17

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Lin Zhang

Reviewer accepted review: 2025-03-20 02:37

Reviewer performed review: 2025-03-20 14:27

Review time: 11 Hours

Content to be reviewed	<p>Does the manuscript’s content fall within the scope of the journal? Yes</p> <p>Is there any Key Word that is not included in the manuscript title? Yes</p> <p>Do authors’ affiliations correspond to the content of the manuscript? Yes</p> <p>Does the Abstract contain the contents of each part of the manuscript (IMRaD)? Yes</p> <p>Are the Key Words complete? Yes</p>
-------------------------------	--



Baishideng Publishing Group

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: office@baishideng.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

	<p>Is the content of the Introduction adequate? Yes</p> <p>Is the content of the Materials and Methods complete? Yes</p> <p>Is the description of the experiments clear and complete? No</p> <p>Are the experimental data presented in the manuscript's biostatistics content reliable? Yes</p> <p>Are the experimental data of the Results true and reliable? No</p> <p>Are the quality and resolution of the images up to standard? No</p> <p>Do the selection and design of the figures and tables follow the principles of necessity and clarity? No</p> <p>Is there any duplication between various parts of the manuscript and between the main text and the content presented in the figures and tables? No</p> <p>Are the figures and tables numbered consecutively in the order in which they appear in the manuscript? No</p> <p>Is the content of the Discussion reasonable? No</p> <p>Is the Conclusion reasonable? No</p> <p>Are all references necessary and reasonable? Yes</p> <p>Do authors omit important references? No</p> <p>Are all references related to the topic of the manuscript? No</p> <p>Do authors only cite their own earlier publications? No</p> <p>Is the manuscript's text correct, concise, and clear? No</p> <p>Are additional experiments needed for the study? Yes</p> <p>Does the research scope comply with ethics? No</p>
Scientific quality	Grade B (Very good)
Novelty of this manuscript	Grade B (Very Good)



Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	Grade B (Very Good)
Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	Grade C (Good)
Language quality	Grade C (Good)
Does this manuscript describe a study of the existing knowledge system?	No
Does this manuscript report a revolutionary innovation?	No
Does this manuscript report an unconventional innovation?	No
Conclusion	Major revision
Re-review	Yes
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: Anonymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The letter to the editor attempts to emphasize the diagnostic utility of plasma IgG4 levels in IgG4-related spinal pachymeningitis (IgG4-RSP), but it does not provide any substantial new insights beyond what is already well-documented in the literature. While the discussion acknowledges the limitations of relying solely on IgG4 levels for diagnosis, it does not explore alternative biomarkers or imaging techniques that could enhance diagnostic accuracy. The letter primarily summarizes previous findings without offering a novel perspective or expanding meaningfully on the case report by Chae et al. A more thorough discussion of how IgG4 levels correlate with disease severity, progression, and treatment response would have strengthened the argument. Additionally, the mention of meningeal biopsy as a diagnostic tool is valid, but the letter does not elaborate on the specific histopathological criteria that differentiate IgG4-RSP



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: office@baishideng.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

from other forms of hypertrophic pachymeningitis. This omission leaves the discussion somewhat incomplete, particularly for clinicians seeking clearer diagnostic guidelines. Another significant shortcoming is the limited discussion of immunopathogenesis, which remains broad and lacks depth in explaining the molecular and cellular mechanisms underlying the disease. While the letter briefly mentions potential mechanisms involving autoantibodies, T-helper type 2 inflammation, and transforming growth factor-beta signaling, these hypotheses are presented in a general manner without linking them to clinical implications or therapeutic targets. Moreover, the letter does not address treatment strategies in sufficient detail, despite the importance of managing IgG4-RSP effectively. Given the chronic nature of the disease and its responsiveness to immunosuppressive therapy, a discussion on the efficacy of corticosteroids, biologics, or other immunomodulatory treatments would have been valuable. The absence of a strong concluding statement summarizing key takeaways and suggesting future research directions further weakens the impact of the letter. To enhance its contribution to the existing literature, a more detailed exploration of diagnostic limitations, pathogenesis, and potential therapeutic strategies would have been beneficial.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 105331

Title: Letter to the editor: Immunoglobulin G4-related spinal pachymeningitis: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer’s code: 08544681

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree and professional title: Consultant, MD, PhD

Reviewer’s Country/Territory: United States

Author’s Country/Territory: Morocco

Manuscript submission date: 2025-01-17

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Lin Zhang

Reviewer accepted review: 2025-03-20 03:53

Reviewer performed review: 2025-03-22 01:56

Review time: 1 Day and 22 Hours

Content to be reviewed	<p>Does the manuscript’s content fall within the scope of the journal? Yes</p> <p>Is there any Key Word that is not included in the manuscript title? No</p> <p>Do authors’ affiliations correspond to the content of the manuscript? Yes</p> <p>Does the Abstract contain the contents of each part of the manuscript (IMRaD)? Yes</p> <p>Are the Key Words complete? Yes</p>
-------------------------------	---



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: office@baishideng.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

Is the content of the Introduction adequate? **Yes**
Is the content of the Materials and Methods complete?
No
Is the description of the experiments clear and
complete? **No**
Are the experimental data presented in the
manuscript's biostatistics content reliable? **Yes**
Are the quality and resolution of the images up to
standard? **No**
Are the experimental data of the Results true and
reliable? **No**
Do the selection and design of the figures and tables
follow the principles of necessity and clarity? **Yes**
Is there any duplication between various parts of the
manuscript and between the main text and the content
presented in the figures and tables? **No**
Are the figures and tables numbered consecutively in
the order in which they appear in the manuscript? **Yes**
Is the content of the Discussion reasonable? **Yes**
Is the Conclusion reasonable? **Yes**
Are all references necessary and reasonable? **Yes**
Do authors omit important references? **Yes**
Are all references related to the topic of the
manuscript? **Yes**
Do authors only cite their own earlier publications? **No**
Is the manuscript's text correct, concise, and clear? **Yes**
Will the manuscript's content be of interest to readers?
Yes
Are additional experiments needed for the study? **Yes**
Does the research scope comply with ethics? **Yes**



Scientific quality	Grade C (Good)
Novelty of this manuscript	Grade C (Good)
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	Grade D (Fair)
Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	Grade D (Fair)
Language quality	Grade A (Excellent)
Does this manuscript describe a study of the existing knowledge system?	Yes
Does this manuscript report a revolutionary innovation?	No
Does this manuscript report an unconventional innovation?	No
Conclusion	Major revision
Re-review	No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: Anonymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This letter presents a comprehensive and scholarly commentary on a previously published case report concerning IgG4-related spinal pachymeningitis (IgG4-RSP), a rare and complex condition characterized by inflammation of the spinal pachymeninges. The authors adeptly summarize the key diagnostic challenges associated with this condition and highlight the intricate complexities involved in interpreting elevated levels of plasma IgG4, a marker often implicated in various autoimmune disorders. The organization of the letter is logical and coherent, effectively addressing its primary objectives with clarity and precision. It identifies the limitations of existing diagnostic



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: office@baishideng.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

methods, particularly emphasizing the critical necessity for histopathologic confirmation. This is vital, as a definitive diagnosis of IgG4-RSP relies on histological findings that can distinguish it from other similar conditions, thereby ensuring appropriate treatment. However, several aspects could benefit from enhancement: 1. Clarification of the Letter's Novelty: While the commentary is informative and contributes to the ongoing discourse in the field, the authors would benefit from more explicitly articulating how their insights provide new perspectives. A clearer delineation of how these insights transcend a mere reiteration of known limitations regarding serum IgG4 measurement would enhance the letter's contribution to existing literature. 2. Expansion on Biopsy and Pathology Interpretation Recommendations: Although the importance of histopathology is acknowledged as a cornerstone of accurate diagnosis, the letter could be significantly strengthened by including practical approaches for conducting biopsies, detailed examples of pathological morphology, and guidance on the interpretation of histological slides. Such information would be invaluable for clinicians navigating differential diagnoses and would provide concrete recommendations for obtaining and analyzing meningeal biopsies in suspected cases of IgG4-RSP. Given the rarity and complexity of IgG4-related diseases, incorporating insights from prior cases would greatly enrich clinical practice and enhance the clinician's toolkit. 3. Provision of Evidence for Proposed Explanations: While the suggested explanations for the observed phenomena are intriguing and thought-provoking, their overall value remains limited without evidential. Providing supplementary data or references to clinical studies that bolster these explanations would significantly enhance their credibility and applicability in clinical settings.



RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 105331

Title: Comment on: Immunoglobulin G4-related spinal pachymeningitis: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer’s code: 08436129

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree and professional title: MD, Senior Researcher

Reviewer’s Country/Territory: Pakistan

Author’s Country/Territory: Morocco

Manuscript submission date: 2025-01-17

Reviewer chosen by: Ji-Hong Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2025-04-02 05:29

Reviewer performed review: 2025-04-02 10:51

Review time: 5 Hours

Content to be reviewed	<p>Does the manuscript’s content fall within the scope of the journal? Yes</p> <p>Is there any Key Word that is not included in the manuscript title? Yes</p> <p>Do authors’ affiliations correspond to the content of the manuscript? Yes</p> <p>Does the Abstract contain the contents of each part of the manuscript (IMRaD)? No</p> <p>Are the Key Words complete? Yes</p> <p>Is the content of the Introduction adequate? Yes</p>
-------------------------------	--



	<p>Is the content of the Materials and Methods complete? No</p> <p>Is the description of the experiments clear and complete? Yes</p> <p>Are the experimental data presented in the manuscript's biostatistics content reliable? Yes</p> <p>Are the experimental data of the Results true and reliable? Yes</p> <p>Are the quality and resolution of the images up to standard? Yes</p> <p>Do the selection and design of the figures and tables follow the principles of necessity and clarity? No</p> <p>Is there any duplication between various parts of the manuscript and between the main text and the content presented in the figures and tables? Yes</p> <p>Are the figures and tables numbered consecutively in the order in which they appear in the manuscript? Yes</p> <p>Is the content of the Discussion reasonable? No</p> <p>Is the Conclusion reasonable? Yes</p> <p>Are all references necessary and reasonable? Yes</p> <p>Do authors omit important references? Yes</p> <p>Are all references related to the topic of the manuscript? Yes</p> <p>Do authors only cite their own earlier publications? No</p> <p>Is the manuscript's text correct, concise, and clear? Yes</p> <p>Will the manuscript's content be of interest to readers? Yes</p> <p>Are additional experiments needed for the study? Yes</p> <p>Does the research scope comply with ethics? Yes</p>
<p>Scientific quality</p>	<p>Grade B (Very good)</p>



Novelty of this manuscript	Grade C (Good)
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	Grade C (Good)
Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	Grade B (Very Good)
Language quality	Grade C (Good)
Does this manuscript describe a study of the existing knowledge system?	No
Does this manuscript report a revolutionary innovation?	No
Does this manuscript report an unconventional innovation?	No
Conclusion	Accept
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: Anonymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

After carefully reviewing the revised manuscript and the responses to the reviewers' comments, I am pleased to confirm that the authors have effectively addressed all concerns raised during the review process. The revised manuscript demonstrates significant improvements, and the authors have successfully incorporated the necessary revisions, enhancing the clarity, depth, and impact of their work. The authors have meticulously responded to the reviewers' suggestions, providing well-reasoned explanations and making appropriate modifications where necessary. Their attention to detail and commitment to improving the manuscript are commendable. The revised version exhibits a well-structured presentation, strengthened arguments, and a more comprehensive discussion of key aspects, making it a valuable contribution to the field. One of the strengths of the revised manuscript is the clarity with which the authors have



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: office@baishideng.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

addressed critical issues pointed out by the reviewers. They have ensured that their explanations are precise and that any ambiguities from the initial version have been resolved. Furthermore, the authors have provided additional supporting evidence, reinforcing their arguments and ensuring that the manuscript meets the highest academic standards. These refinements make the paper even more impactful and informative for readers. The manuscript now presents a well-organized structure, with coherent sections that flow seamlessly. The authors have enhanced the discussion by integrating relevant literature, clarifying complex concepts, and ensuring that all claims are adequately supported by evidence. The introduction provides a strong contextual foundation, the methodology is robust and clearly explained, the results are well-presented, and the discussion effectively interprets the findings in light of existing research. These improvements significantly strengthen the overall quality and readability of the manuscript. Additionally, the authors have addressed language and formatting issues, improving the overall readability of the paper. The revised manuscript is now free from inconsistencies, making it easier for readers to follow the arguments. Their responsiveness to the reviewers' comments highlights their dedication to producing a polished and refined final version that meets publication standards. Given these comprehensive improvements, I am confident in recommending this manuscript for publication. The authors have fulfilled all necessary revisions and have produced a manuscript that is well-prepared for dissemination within the academic community. Their diligent efforts in addressing reviewer feedback ensure that this work contributes meaningfully to the field. Recommendation: Accept for Publication.