

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 33148

**Title:** Acetabular revisions using porous tantalum components: A retrospective study with 5-10 years follow-up

**Reviewer's code:** 02696299

**Reviewer's country:** Slovenia

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2017-03-25

**Date reviewed:** 2017-03-27

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 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"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	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

This is an interesting manuscript dealing with a popular field of revision hip arthroplasty. The authors presented their results of a tantalum acetabular implant in 58 patients requiring revision surgery, which is a significant advantage of the study. They were able to show non-inferior results even in big bone defects of the acetabular rim. Data is presented in a statistically comprehensive way. Also limitations are carefully addressed. However, two points have to be made prior to considering the manuscript for publication: 1. Several language deficiencies are obvious throughout the manuscript - I have outlined some of them in the manuscript-review attached. An English speaker should go through the paper! 2. Radiographs of successful surgical cases should be included - at least one major bone defect before and after revision. Also a difference between a radiolucent line and gap could be made more comprehensive by including x-rays.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 33148

**Title:** Acetabular revisions using porous tantalum components: A retrospective study with 5-10 years follow-up

**Reviewer's code:** 02706155

**Reviewer's country:** China

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2017-03-25

**Date reviewed:** 2017-03-27

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" 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 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

this article has the 5-10 years follow-up, but it hasn't any figures, let the authot provide the figures about the followup.