



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

Manuscript NO: 51742

Title: Day case versus inpatient total shoulder arthroplasty: A retrospective cohort study and cost-effectiveness analysis

Reviewer’s code: 02706155

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor, Professor, Surgeon

Reviewer’s country: China

Author’s country: United Kingdom

Reviewer chosen by: Artificial Intelligence Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-11-17 02:43

Reviewer performed review: 2019-11-20 11:03

Review time: 3 Days and 8 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 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



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

As the authors claimed that Day case total shoulder arthroplasty (TSA) is a novel approach, we need these data accumulation to gather our experience.

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: 51742

Title: Day case versus inpatient total shoulder arthroplasty: A retrospective cohort study and cost-effectiveness analysis

Reviewer's code: 03069318

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Academic Fellow, Senior Postdoctoral Fellow, Surgeon

Reviewer's country: United States

Author's country: United Kingdom

Reviewer chosen by: Ruo-Yu Ma

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-11-25 00:50

Reviewer performed review: 2019-11-25 01:15

Review time: 1 Hour

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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

Introduction Appropriate Line 21-24. An aim should be described. Methods A power analysis is important to determine sample size. Patient reported outcomes and functional assessment outcomes are important for clinical studies. A 3 month follow up is rather short for ROM outcome The primary outcome being the ROM is rather clinical insignificant. I would recommend to focus on the complications and safety as a primary outcome given the short follow up period. Results Appropriate Power calculation based on difference only in abduction seems problematic. Discussion Appropriate

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

BPG Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No