

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 71193

Title: Isolated scaphoid dislocation: A case report and literature review

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05401900

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Iran

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-09-14

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-09-14 08:58

Reviewer performed review: 2021-09-15 07:12

Review time: 22 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 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	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous

statements

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you for your submission. Your manuscript was an interesting read. But the manuscript is not well organized and does not follow a clear flow. Please see the following comments about how your data could be further clarified:

- The radiographs show that there are some chip fractures of the capitate and hamate as well as dislocations in the scaphoid, but the images are not very clear. Has computed tomography or fluoroscopic image been used to confirm this explanation? (Before treatment and after treatment)
- Based on the following reference, if there is a complete rupture in the ligament between the scaphoid bone and the lunite, this injury will be classified as Grade 4. (Geissler, W. B. (2013). Arthroscopic management of scapholunate instability. *Journal of wrist surgery*, 2(02), 129-135.) However, the manuscript states that this ligament between the scaphoid bone and the lunite is intact, but this injury is classified as Grade 4. Please explain about Geissler grade (grade III, II, I, IV) injuries and what is the basis of your classification?
- It is mentioned that the DASH and PRWE scores were 16 and 10, respectively. What is the basis for evaluating and determining these scores? What is the normal range of these scores?
- The content presented in the discussion section is very large and therefore it is very difficult to understand and compare these explanations. And I think it would be more useful to present this material in a series of tables.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 71193

Title: Isolated scaphoid dislocation: A case report and literature review

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05476795

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Indonesia

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-09-14

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-09-15 21:14

Reviewer performed review: 2021-09-16 03:38

Review time: 6 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 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
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
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

Authors wrote an interesting report on a case of isolated scaphoid dislocation which was treated with arthroscopy-assisted closed reduction with K-wire internal fixation. This report and literature review covered the incidence of scaphoid dislocations over the years, possible causes, as well as its methods of diagnosis and management. Two things I'd like to add include: 1. Authors should add setbacks encountered during this study and how they were dealt with 2. Limitations of this study should be mentioned and elaborated in the discussion

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 71193

Title: Isolated scaphoid dislocation: A case report and literature review

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05401900

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Iran

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-09-14

Reviewer chosen by: Ji-Hong Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-12-03 15:11

Reviewer performed review: 2021-12-04 03:47

Review time: 12 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

Thanks for your editing.