PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 72757

Title: A nomogram to predict postoperative complications in elderly with total hip replacement

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03475120

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: FACS, MD, PhD

Professional title: Chief Doctor, Director, Doctor, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-10-28

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-11-24 03:43

Reviewer performed review: 2021-11-30 06:27

Review time: 6 Days and 2 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No

| **Peer-reviewer statements** | Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous   [   ] Onymous |
| | Conflicts-of-Interest: [   ] Yes   [Y] No |

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. This paper is well-written, but is not acceptable as a case series. Another journal (e.g., World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery) is suitable for publication. 2. The follow-up term should be shown, because the follow-up term is short. 3. The abbreviation for THA is missing.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 72757

Title: A nomogram to predict postoperative complications in elderly with total hip replacement

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02489089

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: BSc, MSc, PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor, Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Austria

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-10-28

Reviewer chosen by: Xin Liu (Online Science Editor)

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-01-27 08:32

Reviewer performed review: 2022-01-30 18:18

Review time: 3 Days and 9 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear author(s), first of all I would like to say thanks because of the good manuscript you did submit. Here is my result as your reviewer: The title reflects the main subject of your manuscript. On the first after reading the title I expected a graph with al lot of statistical numbers in meaning of a picture in your manuscript but the tables and figures are also quite good. The abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript. Key words reflect the focus of the manuscript. The manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study, but let me say that the backround could be more explained to make clear, why it is important to occupy with your topic. Methods (patients, research methods, statistical analysis) are also described very shortly, but they are explaind enough to know what you did. Results are described in tables which are shown in an appropriate way. The manuscript interprets the findings adequately and appropriately, clearly and logically. Findings are relevant to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner. The discussion is accurate and discusses the paper's scientific significance and relevance to clinical practice sufficiently. Figueres and tables are sufficient, in good quality with appropriate legends. The biostatistic meets the requirements of biostatistics. References are cited appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections. Citations are used in an appropriate way. The quality of manuscript organization and presentation is well, concisely and coherently organized and presented. Style, language and grammar are accurate and appropriate. Author(s) have prepared their manuscripts according to manuscript type of a prospective study. The manuscript meets the requirements of ethics, it was approved by the Ethics Committee of an affiliated Hospital of Guadong

Medical University committee.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous

statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Your corrections are important.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous

statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear author(s), thanks again for giving me the opportunity to do the re-review of your manuscript. I can determine, that all my comments I did in the first review are the same, excluding the part you have to revise in terms of the backround of your study. The backround of the the new version looks more clear in comparison to the first version. It's not really perfect, but in my opinion, acceptable for publication. Best regards! Your reviewer