

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 56447

**Title:** Conversion to reverse shoulder arthroplasty 51 years after shoulder arthrodesis: A case report

**Reviewer's code:** 02445816

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** BSc, MSc, PhD

**Professional title:** Assistant Professor, Physiotherapist

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Greece

**Author's Country/Territory:** Netherlands

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-05-19

**Reviewer chosen by:** Jia-Ping Yan

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-06-19 13:07

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-06-25 23:05

**Review time:** 6 Days and 9 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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 a very interesting case-study and the clinical assessment and management used for this unusual case of shoulder arthrodesis conversion to reverse TSA is of high-quality. The paper is well-written and succinct. The appropriate titles to sub-sections are followed as designated by the Journal. A review of previous similar studies is included. A variety of outcome measures was used (pain, OSS, ROM, certain functional activities). What was also very intriguing is the 51-year time-interval between the 2 operative procedures. The study had an adequate 12-month follow up. Amongst the limitations are that this is a single-participant study with no comparison to another conservative pain-relieving procedure. More similar studies including more participants will be required to reach more definitive conclusions for such pathologies and a conversion in their management if the original arthrodesis proves not successful. p.1-line 13: Case summary p.7-line 13: uneventful

## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 56447

**Title:** Conversion to reverse shoulder arthroplasty 51 years after shoulder arthrodesis: A case report

**Reviewer's code:** 02445816

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** BSc, MSc, PhD

**Professional title:** Assistant Professor, Physiotherapist

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Greece

**Author's Country/Territory:** Netherlands

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-05-19

**Reviewer chosen by:** Ji-Hong Liu (Technical Editor)

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-07-31 21:04

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-07-31 21:18

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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

A well-presented and interesting case study, indeed!