

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 57053

**Title:** Proximal tibial osteotomy for genu varum: Radiological evaluation of deformity correction with a plate vs external fixator

**Reviewer's code:** 03122873

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** DSc, FRCS (Ed), MBBS

**Professional title:** Academic Research, Director, Doctor, Professor

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

**Author's Country/Territory:** United States

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-05-29

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

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-06-22 03:48

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-06-24 06:40

**Review time:** 2 Days and 2 Hours

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 Grade E: Do not publish            |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

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Authors did not discuss about the indications of the medial open-wedge operation. The X-ray of two cases appeared to be of mild deformity. Symptoms and degree of osteoarthritis were not recorded. Other options of treatment e.g. supra patellar tendon lateral osteotomy were not discussed. The indications of surgery were not clear.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 57053

**Title:** Proximal tibial osteotomy for genu varum: Radiological evaluation of deformity correction with a plate vs external fixator

**Reviewer's code:** 02468118

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MSc, PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

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

**Author's Country/Territory:** United States

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-05-29

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

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-07-20 05:29

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-07-31 19:55

**Review time:** 11 Days and 14 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<br><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<br><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 type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority)<br><input checked="" 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<br>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](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Dear Authors, The report of your study is sound and meets the criteria for a scientific manuscript. I have no specific comments except the SF-36 analyses. For me, the very differing follow-up periods in both groups of your patients should be mentioned in the limitation section of your discussion. Average follow-up time says little and may be misleading when the range is 14-86 or 8-62 months. You clearly focused on the surgical technique side of your study, while the quality of life analysis was far more superficial. Some discussion of the SF-36 findings should also be included so that person-centered outcomes are more pronounced in your report. There is no presentation of SF-36 in the methods section. Regards.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 57053

**Title:** Proximal tibial osteotomy for genu varum: Radiological evaluation of deformity correction with a plate vs external fixator

**Reviewer's code:** 02696233

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

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

**Author's Country/Territory:** United States

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-05-29

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

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-09-17 08:25

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-09-20 13:10

**Review time:** 3 Days and 4 Hours

|                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| <b>Scientific quality</b>       | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good<br><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<br><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 type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority)<br><input checked="" 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<br>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](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](https://www.wjgnet.com)

## **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

I read with interest your article submitted to the WJO. This article elicited a number of comments. 1 the methodology is good, the objectives are clear and the scientific contribution is indisputable. However, the fundamental ethical question for me is to know what are the clinical criteria which make you decide on the surgical indication in these patients who certainly have a morphological deformation but very little radiological osteoarthritis as can be seen on the figures. The morphotype of the general population is distributed according to a Gauss curve and only the extremes are at risk without being able to define the borderline exactly. All your study is based on a radiological evaluation and not a clinical one which in my opinion minimizes the relevance of this manuscript. It would be advisable in the discussion chapter to specify what are for you the clinical and radiological symptoms that make you decide an indication for a tibial osteotomy. 2 For a clearer understanding you have to draw a synthetic figure with all the angles and deviations you measure as presented in fig1 for CD Index for example. 3 please precise what are your routine recommendation after surgery in each group (partial or full weight bearing, day of discharge, who is in charge of the manipulation of the EF to modify distraction? 4 who was responsible for the radiological evaluation in this study? 5 according to your results you assess that no differences are found between the 2 methods? Actually your series is not randomized and a selection bias could be argued. We can observe for example that the BMI difference is statistically different between EF and IF. Is the patient status or any other criteria important to make your choice? What are your current indications?

## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 57053

**Title:** Proximal tibial osteotomy for genu varum: Radiological evaluation of deformity correction with a plate vs external fixator

**Reviewer's code:** 02468118

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MSc, PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

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

**Author's Country/Territory:** United States

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-05-29

**Reviewer chosen by:** Xi-Fang Chen (Quit in 2021)

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-11-13 08:03

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-11-15 08:09

**Review time:** 2 Days

|                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| <b>Scientific quality</b>       | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good<br><input checked="" 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<br><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 type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority)<br><input checked="" 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<br>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:** [bpgooffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgooffice@wjgnet.com)  
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

Dear Authors, Thank you for your very kind reply. Nonetheless I find the content of your reply, as well as following amendemends to the paper, unsatisfactory. You argue that Actually the goal of this study was radiological evaluation of the two techniques retrospectively and we wrote the method for radiological evaluation in the method and material part. We mentioned in the part of the result about SF-36 scores and our limitation to evaluate the clinical outcome however the radiological outcome was the goal of the study. We have added some details in limitation based on the valuable reviewer's comment for more clarification. Once again, if your goal was radiological evaluation, why you presented SF-36 in the results section? Or, if you wish to present those findings, the tool should be described in the methods section, and the results need to be discussed. It cannot remain only as an accompaniment to the report. Otherwise those findings are uninformative and misleading. I cannot find any comment to the SF-36 findings in the 'limitations' part, as you have indicated in the reply to the peer-review.



## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 57053

**Title:** Proximal tibial osteotomy for genu varum: Radiological evaluation of deformity correction with a plate vs external fixator

**Reviewer's code:** 02696233

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

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

**Author's Country/Territory:** United States

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-05-29

**Reviewer chosen by:** Xi-Fang Chen (Quit in 2021)

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-11-13 14:15

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-11-16 02:32

**Review time:** 2 Days and 12 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<br><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<br><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)<br><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<br>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](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](http://www.wjgnet.com)

Thank you for your answers and corrections I accept your manuscript