

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 63558

**Title:** Rates of Readmission and Reoperation after Operative Management of Midshaft Clavicle Fractures in Adolescents

**Reviewer's code:** 03731103

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** BM BCh

**Professional title:** Surgeon

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** United Kingdom

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-01-29

**Reviewer chosen by:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-01-30 10:11

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-02-28 06:22

**Review time:** 28 Days and 20 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 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 type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <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 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**

Overall good article. Comments for revision listed below: 1. Include the total number of patients in the study in the abstract. 2. It would be nice to see graphical representation of the data as well as tables, makes it more interesting to the reader. 3. In the limitations mention that this study is unable to comment on long term outcomes. 4. In the limitations mention that future prospective studies (potentially a RCT) would be better at reviewing short/mid/long term outcomes, patient reported outcomes and complications.