



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

Manuscript NO: 63558

Title: Rates of Readmission and Reoperation after Operative Management of Midshaft Clavicle Fractures in Adolescents

Reviewer's code: 03731103

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: BM BCh

Professional title: Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United Kingdom

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2021-01-29

Reviewer chosen by: Ya-Juan Ma

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-01-30 10:11

Reviewer performed review: 2021-02-28 06:22

Review time: 28 Days and 20 Hours

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 Grade E: Do not publish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



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Overall good article. Comments for revision listed below: 1. Include the total number of patients in the study in the abstract. 2. It would be nice to see graphical representation of the data as well as tables, makes it more interesting to the reader. 3. In the limitations mention that this study is unable to comment on long term outcomes. 4. In the limitations mention that future prospective studies (potentially a RCT) would be better at reviewing short/mid/long term outcomes, patient reported outcomes and complications.