

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Orthopedics*

Manuscript NO: 72695

Title: Fragility of statistically significant findings from randomized clinical trials of surgical treatment of humeral shaft fractures: A systematic review

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03069489

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Academic Research, Chief Doctor, Doctor, Lecturer, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Croatia

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2021-10-26

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-11-23 17:30

Reviewer performed review: 2021-12-01 13:09

Review time: 7 Days and 19 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 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 checked="" type="radio"/>] Anonymous [<input type="radio"/>] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [<input type="radio"/>] Yes [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] No
-------------------------------------	---

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Several points need to be addressed before this article is ready for publication. In the part of Keywords: Humerus fracture, open reduction internal fixation, intramedullary nail, fragility index, complications, fragility index) fragility index is repeated. In the introduction you emphasized how: While the vast majority may be managed nonoperatively[1-5], surgical treatment is generally indicated for open fractures, polytrauma patients, ipsilateral humeral shaft and forearm fractures (floating elbow), segmental fractures, and cases of failed treatment in functional brace[3]. Maybe you should change: Currently, there are no defined gold standards for the treatment of humeral shaft fractures. 1.Ouyang H, Xiong J, Xiang P, Cui Z, Chen L, Yu B. Plate versus intramedullary nail fixation in the treatment of humeral shaft fractures: an updated meta-analysis. J Shoulder Elb Surg. 2013;22(3):387-9. 2. Gosler MW, Testroote M, Morrenhof JW, Janzing HM. Surgical versus non-surgical interventions for treating humeral shaft fractures in adults. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2012;1:CD008832.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Orthopedics*

Manuscript NO: 72695

Title: Fragility of statistically significant findings from randomized clinical trials of surgical treatment of humeral shaft fractures: A systematic review

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05915129

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, MMed

Professional title: Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Tanzania

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2021-10-26

Reviewer chosen by: Jin-Lei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-01-21 08:30

Reviewer performed review: 2022-01-29 07:22

Review time: 7 Days and 22 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 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
-------------------------------------	---

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Very well written manuscript and quite an innovational way of applying the concept of FI in interpreting the review's findings to understand the application of available evidence beyond the p-value to clinical application. Consider the comments below 1. Minor grammatical error 2. The assessment of the quality of evidence was missing- i.e. assessment of heterogeneity, assessment of the risk of bias