

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 41615

**Title:** Comparison of implant related complications amongst patients with opioid use disorder and non-users following total knee arthroplasty

**Reviewer's code:** 03069318

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2018-08-17

**Date reviewed:** 2018-09-04

**Review time:** 18 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input 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 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

Abstract Appropriate Introduction Well-presented, informative and interesting  
Methods Well-described Line 101-103. The authors should describe how did they  
identified these patients. Line 104-108 Additional details for the matching process would



**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

be useful. Results In table 1, detailed demographics for both OUD and NOU groups should be provided. Data for readmission need to be described in one of the tables. Discussion Well presented with brief and concise overview of the literature. The authors should highlight what their study adds to the literature specifically. Line 217-219. The potential of confounding factors for the OUD group that could be related to pain, and therefore the use of opioids and simultaneously with increase rate of complications due to the confounding condition itself. Conclusions Appropriate

#### **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:** 41615

**Title:** Comparison of implant related complications amongst patients with opioid use disorder and non-users following total knee arthroplasty

**Reviewer's code:** 03708308

**Reviewer's country:** Italy

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2018-09-11

**Date reviewed:** 2018-09-18

**Review time:** 7 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 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 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 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

The manuscript is an interesting database analysis study comparing the rates of implant complications, 90-day infection rates, 90-day readmission, and hospitalization cost among Opioid Use Disorder patients (OUD) and Non-Users (NUO) undergoing



**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

primary TKA. The paper is well-write, the title is appropriated, and the abstract is exhaustive. The authors compared the two groups (11.536 patients for each one) after an age, gender, and Elixhauser-Comorbidity Index 1:1 match. Implant Complications and Length-of-Stay, Readmission Rates, and Reimbursements were analyzed. The authors concluded that patients with OUD are at a greater risk for implant complications and incur in higher episode of care costs. Comment 1: in methods, authors should report the test used to compare the cost in table 3. Comment 2: In methods, the Elixhauser-Comorbidity Index description should be improved. Comment 3: In results, the authors analyzed many types of complications; revision of knee replacement total, infection and wound, peri-prosthetic fracture around the prosthesis, dislocation of prosthetic implants and others. The authors found many statistically significative differences, but in discussion only the periprosthetic fractures, dislocation, and mechanical loosening were partially commented. Could be interesting for the reader to know the authors' other complications hypotheses.

## **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

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

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

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

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism



**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](http://www.wjgnet.com)

[Y] No

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 41615

**Title:** Comparison of implant related complications amongst patients with opioid use disorder and non-users following total knee arthroplasty

**Reviewer's code:** 00646701

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2018-09-11

**Date reviewed:** 2018-09-18

**Review time:** 7 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input 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 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 no specific comments at this time. This is an extremely well-written manuscript. The purpose, study design, analysis and conclusions are very appropriate given the findings.

## INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

### *Google Search:*

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ [Y] No

### *BPG Search:*

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ [Y] No

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 41615

**Title:** Comparison of implant related complications amongst patients with opioid use disorder and non-users following total knee arthroplasty

**Reviewer's code:** 02703298

**Reviewer's country:** Turkey

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2018-09-11

**Date reviewed:** 2018-09-19

**Review time:** 8 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input 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

**Title:** Main idea is clear and understandable. **Abstract:** Abstract is readable. **Introduction:** Previous pertinent literature cited and discussed. Therefore, introduction is adequate. The necessity for the study is clearly indicated. **Methods:** Study design is appropriate





**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

to achieve study aim. Discussion: Discussion is sufficient. Also, limitations of the study were given. References: References are updated and accurate. Also references are relevant and comprehensive.

#### **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

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

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

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

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