

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

Manuscript NO: 55983

Title: Improved patient reported outcomes with functional articulating spacers in two-stage revision of the infected hip

Reviewer's code: 03478404

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Romania

Author's Country/Territory: Netherlands

Manuscript submission date: 2020-04-11

Reviewer chosen by: Jin-Lei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-09-14 11:44

Reviewer performed review: 2020-09-17 16:08

Review time: 3 Days and 4 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This retrospective cohort study represents the first research of its kind, comparing results on using functional articulating spacer versus a prefabricated spacer, in two-stage revision arthroplasty for periprosthetic infection of the hip. The manuscript is written in an elegant manner; it focuses on an interesting topic, with huge importance for practice and is generally well organized. However, there are some important issues that should be addressed by the authors, in order to improve the manuscript. More attention should be paid to the correct presentation of the data and to details. Comments/suggestions for improvement: 1. Authors should read and revise their manuscript according to the Guidelines for Retrospective cohort studies, issued by the BPG, found at <https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/GerInfo/210>. The requested format of the manuscript is not respected, including the references style. 2. Title contains 19 words, while the maximum admitted is 18. In any case, the title is not correct and should be re-written. The infection eradication rate is not improved with the functional articulating spacers (statistics!). 3. Data about Authorship is missing, but it should be included (affiliations, ORCID numbers, corresponding author etc) 4. Abstract: Please use “Background” instead of Introduction, according to the guidelines issued by the Journal. Please clearly define the AIM (not only “we retrospectively compared...”). Methods: Please mention whether it was a single or multi-centre study, please mention that it was a retrospective cohort study, please specify study location, please include statistics etc (as requested in the guidelines). Please mention also secondary outcomes. Results: Please show whether the results were statistically significant (include p value). After reading the manuscript, it appears that even if infection eradication rate for functional articulating spacer was higher (93%) than for prefabricated spacers (78%), the results do not reach statistical significance ($p>0.05$). Therefore, this eradication rate does not appear improved with the functional articulating

spacers, contrary to the Title, the Core Tip and the Discussion. This is very important. On the other hand, Patient Reported Outcomes were significantly improved with the functional articulating spacers, as it appears from the main manuscript. This should appear from the Abstract as well. Data about complications (secondary outcome) should be also included in the Abstract, as they are statistically significant and favour the functional articulating spacer. Conclusion should be rewritten, mentioning only the results that reach the statistical significance. Conclusion includes “less complications” with the use of the functional articulating spacers; but, as I mentioned before, these are not mentioned in the Results. Please correct. Conclusion has to be definite and clear; therefore, please replace/delete “seem”. The Abstract contains less than 350 words. Please correct. There are enough data to be added from the manuscript. 5. The Core Tip has to be included in the manuscript. In the Core Tip, please remove/replace “seem” and use only results with statistical significance. Data must be correct and precise, highlighting the findings of the whole manuscript. The 2nd sentence is too long (five lines) – please split into two shorter ones. 6. Introduction: please clearly state the aim of the research, at the end of the paragraph. Please delete “We hypothesized functional articulating spacers lead to improved patient reported outcome, fewer complications and shorter in-hospital stay, while maintaining a comparable infection eradication rate as compared to prefabricated antibiotic-loaded hip spacers.”, as it has no relevance. The two groups were compared. Please describe here the characteristics of the two spacers used in the study and not in the “Intervention.” 7. Methods: Please insert in “Data analysis” the p value. 8. Results: are generally well presented. 9. Discussion: This paragraph is generally well conceived, although more comparison to the existing literature should be addressed. The authors did not include any research after 2018 (no reference from 2019 and 2020). Please revise “Infection eradication rate seemed higher for patients treated with a functional articulating spacer than for patients treated with a prefabricated spacer (93% versus 78%

respectively)", which is not correct, as the result did not reach statistical significance. Please revise again the sentence about the better results with the functional articulating spacer in eradicating infection rate, as it is not true (by the end of Discussion). There is no Discussion about Table 2 (causative infectious agents), therefore at least one short sentence should be included. Otherwise, why to have Table 2? Limitations of the study are correct. 10. Please insert the Conclusion. 11. References should be updated, with those from 2019 and 2020 and written in the requested format.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

Manuscript NO: 55983

Title: Improved patient reported outcomes with functional articulating spacers in two-stage revision of the infected hip

Reviewer's code: 00227375

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: Netherlands

Manuscript submission date: 2020-04-11

Reviewer chosen by: Jin-Lei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-09-14 09:58

Reviewer performed review: 2020-09-19 10:13

Review time: 5 Days

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting manuscript about the comparison of patient reported outcome, infection eradication rate, and complications between functional articulating spacers and prefabricated spacers used in two-staged revision arthroplasty for a periprosthetic joint infection of the hip. The data have demonstrated that the percentages of patient acceptable system state for HOOS pain, HOOS PS, HOOS QoL, EQ-5D, and EQ-VAS in functional articulating spacers were significantly higher than those in prefabricated spacers. The authors have suggested that all two-stage revision procedures of the hip should be performed with the use of a functional articulating spacers. This manuscript is nicely structured and well written. However, I have one minor comment about this manuscript. Please consider the following comment. (Comment) Page 6, Results, Functional articulating spacer group, line 2, "24months (range 15-85 months)" Page 16, Table 1, Functional articulating spacer group, Months follow-up (range), "24(16-85)" Is the one or the other correct?

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

Manuscript NO: 55983

Title: Improved patient reported outcomes with functional articulating spacers in two-stage revision of the infected hip

Reviewer's code: 03478404

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Romania

Author's Country/Territory: Netherlands

Manuscript submission date: 2020-04-11

Reviewer chosen by: Han Zhang (Part-Time Editor)

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-10-10 12:57

Reviewer performed review: 2020-10-10 13:26

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous 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: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

I thoroughly reviewed the answers to the reviewers' comments and the corrections of the initial manuscript, made by the authors. The authors revised the manuscript according to the reviewers' suggestions/comments/questions. The manuscript has reached now a high scientific quality and credibility. In the Abstract, the additions/corrections were made. Introduction, Material & Methods, Results, Discussion, and Conclusion are now clear and contain all the necessary data. References have been updated. Very good manuscript!