



**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

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

All the reviewers' comments have been addressed. The changes in the manuscript have been underlined.

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

**Manuscript NO:** 40452

**Title:** Analysis of a Ten Step Protocol to Decrease Postoperative Spinal Wound Infections

**Reviewer's code:** 02444715

**Reviewer's country:** Egypt

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2018-06-25

**Date reviewed:** 2018-06-25

**Review time:** 4 Hours

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 type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you for your comments.

**The paper can be considered as a review article, a well written review article with some suggestions to decrease rate of infection all the recommendations mentioned in the article are already known, and many other recommendations too, to decrease infection, why the authors selected these 10 recommendations?**

Page 4, lines 8-11: A new 10 step protocol was instituted after extensive review of surgical and infection control literature as well as consultation with spine, total joint surgeons in the authors' and other institutions in addition to input from division of infection disease.

**Did the authors get specific data about group of patients did not use these 10 recommendations and the rate of infection in them?**

Yes, this is a subject of another ongoing study.

**I am not sure due to the many variables involved before and after application of the 10-step protocol, which is the variable that changed the rate of infection**

Page 20, line 22 and page 21 lines 1-7: In response to an increasing number of surgical site infections at the authors' institution, a new surgical protocol was initiated in an effort to reduce infection rates after an intensive epidemiological investigation failed to reveal a common source. In view of the absence of a clear cause of the increased infection rate, the authors decided to implement the ten-step protocol targeting areas highlighted by the literature search. As to which factor or factors affected the decreased infection rate is an area of future research.

#### **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

☐ No

***BPG Search:***

☐ The same title

☐ Duplicate publication

☐ Plagiarism

☐ No

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 40452

**Title:** Analysis of a Ten Step Protocol to Decrease Postoperative Spinal Wound Infections

**Reviewer's code:** 02444795

**Reviewer's country:** United Kingdom

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2018-06-25

**Date reviewed:** 2018-06-26

**Review time:** 1 Day

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 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you for your comments.

I am unclear as to how the link between the described 10 steps in the change in practice in the author's unit relates to the limited review of the literature. No detail is



**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>

given on the two cohort groups or on confounding factors. In fact virtually no detail is given. Therefore the submission becomes a review article but with no meta analysis performed or detailed tabulation of the contents/ outcomes of the studies included. Therefore I am unclear as to the purpose of this article.

The study type has been changed to systemic review.

#### **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:** 40452

**Title:** Analysis of a Ten Step Protocol to Decrease Postoperative Spinal Wound Infections

**Reviewer's code:** 02696299

**Reviewer's country:** Slovenia

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2018-06-25

**Date reviewed:** 2018-06-29

**Review time:** 4 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input 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 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 type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you for your comments.

**The manuscript is a high quality overview of one of the most problematic areas in spine surgery - perioperative infections. The design of the paper highlights nicely a**

conglomerate of various reasons / causes that should be addressed when trying to combat higher than usual infection rates. With regard to that, the authors failed to mention what was the infection rate in their institution prior to implementation of the 10-step protocol. It might be interesting to see if the infection rate dropped by 2 or 3 times. This way the manuscript would gain some scientific leverage as a reference for further studies.

Page 4, lines 11-13: The postoperative SSI rate in the period preceding the implementation of the ten-step protocol climbed to 10%. Institution of this bundle returned SSI rates to historic level of < 1%.

The title »Analysis of a ten step protocol to decrease postoperative spinal wound infections« reflects the main subject of the manuscript. The abstract summarizes and reflects the work described in the manuscript adequately. Key words reflect the focus of the manuscript. The manuscript adequately describes the background, present status and significance of the study. The manuscript describes relevant literature overview in adequate detail. The objectives achieved by the manuscript are clearly defined and presented. The manuscript interprets the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically. The findings and their applicability to the literature are stated in a clear and definite manner. The discussion discusses the paper's scientific significance and relevance to clinical practice sufficiently. The authors cite the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and the discussion sections. The manuscript is well presented, and concisely and coherently organized. The style, language and grammar are accurate and appropriate. The manuscript is prepared according to the appropriate research methods and reporting.



**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

Thank you for your comments.

#### INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

##### *Google Search:*

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

##### *BPG Search:*

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