

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Orthopedics*

Manuscript NO: 66409

Title: Arthroscopic vs open ankle arthrodesis: A prospective case series with seven years follow-up

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03518978

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2021-03-28

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-04-13 13:40

Reviewer performed review: 2021-04-14 01:17

Review time: 11 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 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
statements**Peer-Review: [☒] Anonymous [☐] OnymousConflicts-of-Interest: [☐] Yes [☒] No**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

This study compared the outcomes of open and arthroscopic ankle arthrodesis in patients with end-stage ankle osteoarthritis. It has been found that both treatments are valid and safe, and that the arthroscopic procedure shows faster improvements in the medium term. It is also worth noting that the group treated with the arthroscopic procedure in the medium-term control had a shorter hospital stay and a better union rate. Generally, this is a pretty interesting study. It has relevance to sufficient clinical practice. However, there are a few concerns that need to be addressed: 1. The sample sizes were relatively small. 2. Seventeen patients were excluded from further analysis and 7 patients with incomplete clinical follow-up. There were too many patients that were lost in follow-up. The included cases might not represent the target population completely. 3. It is better to add some X-rays of typical patients.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Orthopedics*

Manuscript NO: 66409

Title: Arthroscopic vs open ankle arthrodesis: A prospective case series with seven years follow-up

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03765426

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2021-03-28

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-04-15 03:44

Reviewer performed review: 2021-04-18 10:57

Review time: 3 Days and 7 Hours

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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] Anonymous [<input type="radio"/>] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [<input type="radio"/>] Yes [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] No
-------------------------------------	---

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors reported the comparataive study about open vs. arthroscopic ankle arthrodesis. The study is very intersting for readers, but this study is inherently problematic as a comparative study, because the indication for surgical management was totally different. Open surgery was performed for severe deformity, and arthroscopic technique was used for minor ankle alignment. Unfortunately, for scientific value, it only reports two case series. Basically, the manuscript is well written and easily to understand for readers. But, this paper needs some modifications. 1. Numbers should be rounded to two decimal places. For examples, $67.00 \pm 2.55 >>> 67.0 \pm 2.6$ 2. I believe that we should not use ns, because you did not prove it. We can only say that p is not under 0.05. So, you can describe $p=0.593$, etc. 3. I am concerned about capitalization. X-Ray>X-ray Authors>authors Score>score significative>significant both group> both groups consist in>consist of

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Orthopedics*

Manuscript NO: 66409

Title: Arthroscopic vs open ankle arthrodesis: A prospective case series with seven years follow-up

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03518978

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2021-03-28

Reviewer chosen by: Han Zhang (Online Science Editor)

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-09-16 07:57

Reviewer performed review: 2021-09-18 00:55

Review time: 1 Day and 16 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous



**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>

statements

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors have addressed my concerns. I agree to publish this paper. Thanks!