

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Orthopedics*

Manuscript NO: 67609

Title: All-epiphyseal versus trans-epiphyseal screw fixation for tillaux fractures: Does it matter?

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05395420

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MS, PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2021-06-11

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-06-18 02:54

Reviewer performed review: 2021-06-18 03:29

Review time: 1 Hour

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 Grade E: Do not publish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



**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>

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Abstract Line no 52 typo Line no 53 No need to reference tables in abstract Line no 54,44 Kindly rephrase Line No 75 rephrase Line No 297,298 Did u have any rationale behind the allocation of patients to the group concerned becoz if the allocation was random then the effects of the study could be accepted, since its a retrospective evaluation dont u think the reason for this allocation might be based on a rationale that resulted in the equality of the outcomes observed. If so kindly mention Line no 309 typo