

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 38332

**Title:** Single rod instrumentation in patients with scoliosis and co-morbidities: indications and outcomes

**Reviewer's code:** 00383760

**Reviewer's country:** China

**Science editor:** Li-Jun Cui

**Date sent for review:** 2018-02-10

**Date reviewed:** 2018-02-13

**Review time:** 2 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input type="checkbox"/> No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I have the following questions and comments. 1. In the conclusion of the abstract, the author stated that "this technique may reduce operative time, blood loss and associated surgical morbidity". But the author did not present data to compare this technique with



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,  
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://** www.wjgnet.com

other techniques. We are actually not sure whether this technique may “reduce” operative time, blood loss or surgical morbidity. I suggest that the author could say that “this technique is a reasonable alternative. Further studies comparing outcomes of different techniques are warranted to determine the best option in different scenarios.” 2. In the Results section, page 9, paragraph on Group C, the author stated that “this was associated with high patient satisfaction and good functional outcome. The author should do statistical comparison of the questionnaire scores before and after surgery. 3. In the Discussion section, the author should present literature findings on operative time and blood loss of similar patients undergoing single rod and dual instrumentation so that readers have a better idea how the author’s findings compare with others. The author should also compare his own results of single rod with his own results of dual instrumentation or other techniques, which comprised about 90% of his practice.

## **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

### ***Google Search:***

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

### ***BPG Search:***

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 38332

**Title:** Single rod instrumentation in patients with scoliosis and co-morbidities: indications and outcomes

**Reviewer's code:** 00501340

**Reviewer's country:** Greece

**Science editor:** Li-Jun Cui

**Date sent for review:** 2018-02-10

**Date reviewed:** 2018-02-22

**Review time:** 12 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input type="checkbox"/> No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript is introducing and supporting the single rod instrumentation technique as a different way of deformity correction for scoliotic children. The paper is interesting as there are not many previous references regarding the treatment of scoliosis using



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,  
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://** www.wjgnet.com

single rod construct. It is well presented, however some minor concerns are listed. Title: The aim of the study is well stated and clearly mentioned. Introduction: At the end of the first paragraph, where the animal models are mentioned, it is advisable to be further explained the existing data of single rod application in comparison to the double rod technique. Materials and Methods: The methodology of the study, the selection of the patients and their data are well presented and clearly explained. The organization in separate paragraphs, where the procedure is analyzed, is very helpful in conjunction with the addition of the figures. The authors do not mention pre-op flexibility. If pre-op flexibility has not been recorded this should be stated in the limitations of the study. Results: The analysis of the results in the three different patients groups is helpful since the reader can clearly understand the indications, the amount of correction and the complications between the separate group patients. One minor thought concerns the complications which include only a few years after surgery. It would be interested to present the viability of the single rod constructs and the complications for a longer time period after surgery. In the summary data of complications in table 1 is 2, although in the text the amount of complications is 4 and therefore it should be corrected appropriately. Discussion: The advantages and the indications of single rod instrumentation are well stated, as well as the limitations of the study, which lies in the heterogeneity of patients who are included in Groups A and B. The addition of the X-rays with legend explanation is very informative and also the tables help reader to have quick and totally access to the data and the results of the study.

## **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

### ***Google Search:***

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

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

**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242

**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243

**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

**<https://www.wjgnet.com>**

[ ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

***BPG Search:***

[ ] The same title

[ ] Duplicate publication

[ ] Plagiarism

[Y] No