Comments to the Editor,

This manuscript studied the relationship between 6 polymorphisms/SNPs from *RHOB* and *FAM167A-BLK* genes and susceptibility to systemic sclerosis (SSc) in a Han Chinese population. In general, the quality of writing, presentation and statistical analysis are not suitable to be published in the present status.

1. The title is not appropriate: the SNPs genotyped in the manuscript have been reported to be associated with SSc, and thus they are not “new” possible SNPs as described by the authors.
2. The context of the following sentence in the ABSTRACT is not clear: “However, the loci of the SNPs that displayed an association with SSc are quite different from the loci identified in studies of Caucasian populations.
3. The authors claimed that “This is the first large-scale genetic association study of polymorphisms in non-human leukocyte antigen genes associated with SSc in a Chinese Han population”. I am wondering whether the authors have reviewed the literatures about SSc association study because a non-HLA gene STAT4 has been reported to be a risk factor for SSc in a much larger Chinese population.
4. “Our results confirm that RHOB and FAM167A-BLK polymorphisms exist in Chinese Han SSc patients, which indicates that RHOB and FAM167A-BLK may be associated with susceptibility to SSc”. Polymorphisms mean the occurrence of more than one allele but can’t infer susceptibility association itself between Polymorphism and disease. Please make clear of the definition first and such sentences should be changed throughout the whole manuscript.
5. “A few” should be replaced by a specific number in the METHOD of the ABSTRACT.
6. Detailed information about “matched by age” should be provided.
7. Logistic regression adjusted by age and gender should be conducted besides chi-square test.
8. Multiple testing correction should be considered in the analysis, such as Bonferroni correction.
9. References should be added when the work published was cited by the authors. For example, references should be added in Line 101 and 105 when they described the SNPs.
10. The gene names should be italic.
11. The authors need to improve the quality of writing and presentation, including English editing and the logic in context.