

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Orthopedics

**Manuscript NO:** 39273

**Title:** Anterior transolecranon dislocation of the elbow in a child: A case report

**Reviewer's code:** 00501325

**Reviewer's country:** Egypt

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2018-05-05

**Date reviewed:** 2018-05-08

**Review time:** 2 Days

| SCIENTIFIC QUALITY                                | LANGUAGE QUALITY  | CONCLUSION   | PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS                      |
|---|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent       | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing       | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept                    | Peer-Review:                                  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language | (High priority)                                    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good | polishing   | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair            | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of           | (General priority)                                 | Peer-reviewer's expertise on the              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not          | language polishing  | <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision            | topic of the manuscript:                      |
| publish   | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced  |
|   |   | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection                 | <input type="checkbox"/> General              |
|   |   |  | <input type="checkbox"/> No expertise         |
|   |   |  | Conflicts-of-Interest:                        |
|   |   |  | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes                  |
|   |   |  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No        |

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear authors, you did your best and present this uncommon case. Therefore I thank your effort. Please revise your manuscript to be more readable. Title: Irreducible Anterior Transolecranon Fracture Dislocation of the Elbow in a Child: A Case Report. The irreducibility is a matter of a hand skill, therefore it has no place in the title and

transolecranon serve as fracture, therefore, no need for redundancy. Abstract: Please omit the word fracture "sequellar flexum" the statement is not common in the English literature, it is better to use "extension lag" or "flexion deformity" according to your clinical finding Case Report: "with complete functional disability of the left upper limb" This statement conflicts with next statement "The neurovascular status of the limb was intact, range of motion was restricted by pain, and the fingers were mobile and sensitive." "the radial pulse was strong" it is better to say "the radial pulse was palpable and equal to the contralateral side". "An external approach" what approach (lateral approach) or (Boyd and Speed approach) please describe "sequellar 10° of flexum" please revise What about the range of supination and pronation movements Discussion: "Postoperative stability was maintained by a splint with 90° flexed elbow" A figure without a legend shows the elbow in more than 90 degree flexion. You state "We selected simple immobilization of the elbow until consolidation because stable reduction of the olecranon was achieved." Then you state "The reduction in this patient was good but inadequate, which explains the residual flexum." How to reconcile the two sentences Conclusion The conclusion is just allegations and has insufficient support. Figures Figure 1 and 3 of no importance Figure 4: I see only radiohumeral articulation in a good position but what about the ulno-humeral articulation and I could not see the olecranon. therefore this figure appears irrelevant. Next figure has no comment or number why? Figure 5 Post-operative lateral X-ray :At any time postoperatively this radiograph was made, and how you can explain the fragmentation of the olecranon Figure 6: X-rays showing beginning of healing of the olecranon. What are the visible signs of healing Figure 7: It is best to present a photo of both upper limbs to compare

## INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

*Google Search:*



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,  
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://** www.wjgnet.com

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ [Y] No

***BPG Search:***

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ [Y] No

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Orthopedics

**Manuscript NO:** 39273

**Title:** Anterior transolecranon dislocation of the elbow in a child: A case report

**Reviewer's code:** 00501328

**Reviewer's country:** France

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2018-05-05

**Date reviewed:** 2018-05-22

**Review time:** 17 Days

| SCIENTIFIC QUALITY                                | LANGUAGE QUALITY   | CONCLUSION   | PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS                     |
|---|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent       | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing        | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept                    | Peer-Review:                                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good       | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language             | (High priority)                                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good            | polishing  | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous             |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of | (General priority)                                 | Peer-reviewer's expertise on the             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not          | language polishing   | <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision            | topic of the manuscript:                     |
| publish   | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced |
|   |  | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection                 | <input type="checkbox"/> General             |
|   |  |  | <input type="checkbox"/> No expertise        |
|   |  |  | Conflicts-of-Interest:                       |
|   |  |  | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes                 |
|   |  |  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No       |

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The case is interesting and it may benefit WJO readers. English language needs extensive revision. Please revise. Authors should contact the patient and do QuickDASH score and report results. This will give better feeling and help quantify upper extremity disability. Please revise. The sentence "with complete functional disability of the left upper limb" is



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,  
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://** www.wjgnet.com

in contrast with the following sentence "The neurovascular status of the limb was intact, range of motion was restricted by pain, and the fingers were mobile and sensitive". Which one is correct? Please clarify and modify text accordingly. Similarly, authors write "We selected simple immobilization ... of the olecranon was achieved". Later they write "The reduction in this patient ... residual flexum". Not clear, please be consistent. Discussion is poorly written and needs specific support by references. Please re-write. Why your case is unique? What lessons you learned from this case? These points need to be clarified/expanded. What is the "take-home" message? Quality of pictures is low, please provide better quality pictures. Please reduce the number of pictures and include only relevant ones.

#### **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

##### ***Google Search:***

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

##### ***BPG Search:***

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No