

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 58153

Title: Early complications of preoperative external traction fixation in the staged treatment of tibial fractures: a series of 402 cases

Reviewer's code: 02689304

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Taiwan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-07-10

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-07-10 11:18

Reviewer performed review: 2020-07-13 11:38

Review time: 3 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The framework of writing is intact. However, English use still requires re-checking (e.g. 402 cases series, line 2 and ---). Some doubts require clarification: 1. The conclusion in Abstract (line 27-34) is too long. It had better be simplified. 2. This treatment regimen is for temporary use before definite internal fixation is performed. In Highlights, long-term safety (line 49) is suggested to follow. What do you mean? 3. In Results, description of demography (line 166-171) had better be used with a ratio. The exact number makes confusing. 4. Line 171-173, what do you mean? 5. Line 189, discharge is generally due to too small incision wound for pin insertion with poor drainage. With a short period of pin insertion in this study, the causes of discharge problems should be searched with discussion. 6. In Discussion, the authors should search for some prior articles about the safe periods of primary external fixation and secondary internal fixation. The internal fixation includes an intramedullary nail or plate. If the secondary internal fixation is performed beyond the safe period, how to handle to prevent deep infection? 7. In Table 1, the orientation of pin insertion is doubtful. The principle of pin insertion is from a dangerous zone to a safe zone for prevention of damage by pin deviation. Therefore, at the femur supracondyle, the starting point is from the lateral aspect (for the common peroneal nerve). Similarly, at the whole tibia (for nerves and vessels), at the calcaneus (for the posterior tibial artery). Explanation is necessary in Discussion section.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 58153

Title: Early complications of preoperative external traction fixation in the staged treatment of tibial fractures: a series of 402 cases

Reviewer's code: 02689304

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Taiwan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-07-10

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ping Yan

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-08-24 11:42

Reviewer performed review: 2020-08-25 11:40

Review time: 23 Hours

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

The revised manuscript is acceptable.