

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

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 32148

**Manuscript Type:** Original Article

Basic Study

**Role of fast-setting cements in arthroplasty: A comparative analysis of characteristics**

Caraan NA *et al.* comparative analysis of fast-setting cements

**Neil Ayrón Caraan, Reinhard Windhager, Jason Webb, Nadine Zentgraf, Klaus-Dieter Kuehn**

Correspondence to: Neil Ayrón Caraan, MD, Department of Orthopaedics and Orthopaedic Surgery, Medical University of Vienna, Vienna 1090, Währinger Gürtel 18-20, Austria. [neil.caraan@gmx.at](mailto:neil.caraan@gmx.at)

Telephone: +43-676-4223760

Fax: +43-1-40400-40290

**Answering reviewers:**

Peer review report #1

**Reviewer's code:** 02444701

**Reviewer's country:** Greece

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2016-12-30

**Date reviewed:** 2017-01-11

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<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: Poor	<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: Rejected	Google Search: <input type="checkbox"/> The same title <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism <input type="checkbox"/> No BPG Search: <input type="checkbox"/> The same title <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept <input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a well written manuscript. Authors have shown that both "fast setting " cements have similar behavior, compliant with the international standards. Results can be used by physicians to improve their daily practice and also by researchers, as reference for future investigations.

### MY ANSWER:

Thank you very much for your kind and honest comments. It was our goal to exhibit our results to physicians for their daily clinical use of bone cements as well as to researchers.

## Peer review report #2

**Reviewer's code:** 02444740

**Reviewer's country:** Israel

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2017-03-10

**Date reviewed:** 2017-03-11

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" 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 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		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a vary well planned and written article and should be accepted for publication.

### MY ANSWER:

Thank you for your competent evaluation and we are happy that you appreciated our manuscript.

## Peer review report #3

**Reviewer's code:** 02444795

**Reviewer's country:** United Kingdom

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2017-03-10

**Date reviewed:** 2017-03-12

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" 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 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 type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

A straightforward but well constructed study which complements current knowledge. Please provide a little bit more detail on the mixing technique/ bowls used, if this was done by one individual, was this an experienced mixer of cement, etc

### MY ANSWER:

I really appreciate your comments and will add more information about the mixing process into our manuscript.

## Peer review report #4

**Reviewer's code:** 03068027

**Reviewer's country:** United Kingdom

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2017-03-10

**Date reviewed:** 2017-03-17

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		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an excellent piece of work with valuable information on fast setting cement. There is only one point which could be improved. Meanwhile the Palacos fast setting cement offers some advantages compared to the CMW 2G as per the study the authors don't mention that in the conclusion or in the abstract. Please add this to the abstract or conclusion

### MY ANSWER:

We were delighted reading your comments and your evaluation. I will surely add these advantages into the manuscript.

## Peer review report #5

**Reviewer's code:** 02444730

**Reviewer's country:** Greece

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2017-03-10

**Date reviewed:** 2017-03-18

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

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a comparative study concerning the characteristics of two fast-setting cements. The study is very well executed and presented. COMMENTS I would suggest the authors to start with the important findings of the study followed by the rest of the discussion. The paragraph concerning the Simplex?P SpeedSet? cement could be omitted or used later and not as second one off the discussion.

### MY ANSWER:

I truly cherished reading your evaluation and comments. Your opinion regarding the paragraph about the Simplex P Speed cement is very much appreciated and I will try to move it a little bit to the back of the discussion.