

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

Manuscript NO: 32021

Title: Functional outcomes of traumatic and non-traumatic rotator cuff tears after arthroscopic repair

Reviewer's code: 00731540

Reviewer's country: United Kingdom

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-12-25

Date reviewed: 2016-12-27

| CLASSIFICATION | LANGUAGE EVALUATION | SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT | CONCLUSION |
|---|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing | Google Search: | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title | <input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism | <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor | | [Y] No | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision |
| | | BPG Search: | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism | |
| | | [Y] No | |

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear authors: Thank you for submitting your work which should be accepted for publication after some clarifications and revisions. Please find my comments below. 1. Is this a prospective or retrospective study? Please mention clearly in the beginning of methods. 2. There is no clear follow up protocol as the mean follow up is 43 months with very wide range of (24 to 72)months. You need to explain the follow up protocol and at what point in time were the clinical assessment for study and scoring performed. As clearly achieving similar score at 24 month by one patient and at 72 months by other patient is not comparable. It would have been better to compare all at approx. 24 months interval which is a reasonable time to recover from cuff surgery. *****More importantly, patients were treated from June to December 2014, then how is it possible to have an average follow up of 43 months with a range of (24 to 72) months by December 2016.***** 3. What was the time interval between the trauma and the the time of surgery in traumatic group as if there was significant delay in diagnosis or surgery they really does



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

not class as acute repair . 4. Traumatic group having the same age are expected to have some age related changes and the possibility of acute on chronic tear and if there was significant delay between traumatic event and surgery, it defy the purpose of study. 5. Based on the above limitations of the study, conclusion should be carefully crafted. I wish you luck with your study and would be happy to consider it for publication after revision. Regards Reviewer



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

Manuscript NO: 32021

Title: Functional outcomes of traumatic and non-traumatic rotator cuff tears after arthroscopic repair

Reviewer's code: 00722050

Reviewer's country: Canada

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-12-25

Date reviewed: 2017-01-10

| CLASSIFICATION | LANGUAGE EVALUATION | SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT | CONCLUSION |
|---|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing | Google Search: | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title | <input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor | | BPG Search: | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism | |
| | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | |

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The primary outcome was modified UCLA (University of California, Los Angeles) score validated for the Portuguese language, which takes into account pain, function, range of motion, strength and patient satisfaction