

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

Manuscript NO: 62837

Title: Outcome and revision rate of uncemented humeral head resurfacing. Mid-term follow-up study

Reviewer's code: 04083668

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Lecturer, Reader (Associate Professor), Surgeon, Surgical Oncologist, Teacher

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Spain

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2021-01-27

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-01-29 19:02

Reviewer performed review: 2021-01-31 19:49

Review time: 2 Days

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I should suggest to look for a more striking title, however it describes which is this retrospective work. Abstract is properly order and it shows outcomes and follow-up after this surgery. But there are some sentences that must be analyzed. The authors remark that HHR is an option in AVN, but be careful with this statement as in AVN you could find distortion of the bone architecture and this could made the HHR failed. That is what happen in the hip when AVN affects most of the head. Another statement says that they use a radiographical evaluation, but which are the items they employed for that. They do not show any scale. Definition of vertical instability, loosening or degenerative changes cannot be quantify and in this cases it is quite difficult to evaluate

Maybe in the key-words you should include OA and AVN in order to find this article in a subject headings look. Background: They show in the background some statements that could be questionable. I do not agree with the indication of this prosthesis in cases of rotator cuff artropathy or even in post-traumatic arthritis as the integrity of the cuff is important for a good function. They make a proper definition of the objectives of the manuscript. Material: It is a very short serie, However, it is a prospectively collection of patients so there is a clear definition of the objectives. Surgeries are done by the same surgeon. They should define clearly inclusion and exclusion criteria, I mean a partial rotator cuff is an exclusion criteria or they repair this lesion; which is the meaning of damaged glenoid a little defect close to a SLAP lesión or a deformity secondary to a previous fracture with good result.... Which is the objective of putting the shoulder in and abduction pillow??? This manouvre is used in cases of tear of the SE e IE when they are repaired to protect sutures for a while. Results are agree with the planning of the authors. There is an improve in shoulder function after this surgery, except in the case

with vertical instability and some cases with erosion of the glenoid surface. It seems that 1 out of 6 prosthesis failed after 8 years. Discussion: They state that this prosthesis is a good option to preserve bone, but if we have a large destruction after an osteonecrosis there is no way to restore bone and fixation of the implant is a real problem. Figures and tables are OK and statistical study is correct though there are few cases. The manuscript is coherent with the objective of the idea and it is well presented. Language is appropriate

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

Manuscript NO: 62837

Title: Outcome and revision rate of uncemented humeral head resurfacing. Mid-term follow-up study

Reviewer's code: 02694731

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Adjunct Professor, Doctor, Senior Lecturer, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Switzerland

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2021-01-27

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-01-28 08:33

Reviewer performed review: 2021-02-11 13:31

Review time: 14 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" 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 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

Dear Authors, you made a valuable contribution to shoulder arthroplasty. Although your manuscript has the potential to be accepted for publication, I cannot recommend publication in its current state. Please see my comments and suggestions in the reviewed manuscript. Furthermore, please add that your conclusion that your data are only based on a very small cohort of patients. When this cohort is very homogenous the results are still of relevant value. Please deliver your arguments addressing this aspect.