

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 57468

**Title:** The use of short stems in revision of standard femoral stem: A case report

**Reviewer's code:** 00735715

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** India

**Author's Country/Territory:** Italy

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-06-10

**Reviewer chosen by:** Jia-Ping Yan

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-06-19 10:04

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-06-25 13:43

**Review time:** 6 Days and 3 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](http://www.wjgnet.com)

In this manuscript, the authors described a fractured femoral stem of the previous THR is replaced with a short stem prosthesis. They have elaborated on the advantages of short stem prosthesis, its indications. The narration of the case is also interesting. Title, Abstract, and References The title is good and representing your objectives. The abstract is written nicely. References are relevant, recent, and cited properly. Introduction Here the authors failed to explain the importance of their case and use of short stem prosthesis in it. I think your objective was to describe the application of a biological short stem in a revision THR. From this single experience, we cannot propose its application to various indications. Case presentation It will be much better if you elaborately describe your case. Was he completely asymptomatic till the injury? What was the mode of injury? It is difficult to understand how a trivial injury causes fracture of a femoral stem without fracturing shaft. Looking at your X-ray image it appears to me that the fracture of the stem is a chronic one and maybe it got displaced during the present injury. It has happened due to microtrauma. There is a thickening of the shaft at the distal end of the stem and the proximal part is loose without osteointegration. This leads to a varus strain on the stem and caused its fracture. It is better to have a series of radiographs if available to avoid confusion in readers. What was the cause for foot drop? What happened to it in your followup? Treatment and follow up part is good. Discussion Here also your discussion is mainly about the advantages of short stem prosthesis disadvantages of conventional stems and description of Fitmore prosthesis. In my opinion, you should explain your case and results in the discussion part. Highlight the points you want to express before readers rather than elaborating on known facts. Were there any problems during surgery? Is there osteointegration of prosthesis? Was the removal difficult? Are there other options in such situations for the removal of the distal part of the stem and revision with that part? Like you have put an uncemented stem with cement what are the probable problems you expect ? and how it performed in your patients. What are the probable indications other



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](http://www.wjgnet.com)

than a broken distal stem for this procedure? Anyway a nice wok. Regards.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 57468

**Title:** The use of short stems in revision of standard femoral stem: A case report

**Reviewer's code:** 01221812

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Pakistan

**Author's Country/Territory:** Italy

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-06-10

**Reviewer chosen by:** Jia-Ping Yan

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-06-19 10:35

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-06-26 05:35

**Review time:** 6 Days and 18 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

THE USE OF SHORT STEMS IN REVISION OF STANDARD FEMORAL STEM: A CASE REPORT AND REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE It is a report of only a single patient. It is an interesting study, however, the manuscript would benefit from the following changes/revision: 1. Please mention the age of patient at the time of current study. 2. Introduction, second paragraph. No citation is given. Please give proper citation of material/text. 3. Discussion is not relevant to the procedure performed, rather it fits more in the Introduction. Please discuss the modalities of the procedure performed and compare/contrast with literature. 4. It would be pertinent to mention the basic demographic and physical features of the patient like origin, ethnicity, weight, height, etc. 5. There are several types which need to be fixed. For instance, page 2, .....Department of Surgety,..... 6. It is recommended to cite recent References.