

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-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 75828

Title: Arthroscopy with subscapularis upper one-third tenodesis for treatment of

recurrent anterior shoulder instability independent of glenoid bone loss

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05077771 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: MSc

**Professional title:** Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Greece

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-02-16

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-05-07 12:33

Reviewer performed review: 2022-05-08 19:05

**Review time:** 1 Day and 6 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [ Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No



Baishideng **Publishing** 

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

Peer-Review: [ ] Anonymous [Y] Onymous

statements

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

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This well written manuscript presents an alternative technique for anterior shoulder instability in non-randomized patients that focuses on subscapular tenodesis. It is interesting to note that the postoperative follow-up does not show a limitation in the external rotation of the shoulder, although the external rotation of these patients with the hand on the side has not been measured.



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-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 75828

Title: Arthroscopy with subscapularis upper one-third tenodesis for treatment of

recurrent anterior shoulder instability independent of glenoid bone loss

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03999237 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: MS

**Professional title:** Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-02-16

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-05-15 01:02

Reviewer performed review: 2022-05-30 01:01

**Review time:** 14 Days and 23 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No



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

Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous

statements Conflic

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

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

the surgical technique involved iliac crest autograft also - this modification required has not been mentioned in the abstract only subscapularis tenodesis mentioned bone grafting done for all patients what was the average size of the glenoid defect measured with CT please explain rationale for using iliac crest graft vs coracoid process - latarjet discussion In the current study, iliac crest bone autograft was shown to have a low risk and required only 3 surgical approaches, whereas Latarjet surgery required at least 5 surgical approaches. Our graft healed better due to suspension fixation. This statement is not clear - latarjet surgery requiring 5 approaches graft healed better due to suspension fixation - clarify and give references This technique is more anatomic without damaging the sternoclavicular arch structure. Finally, the operative time was short; however, after bone grafting was completed, the shoulder space is very narrow and tension make augmentation of the subscapularis difficult. An iliac crest bone autograft can further strengthen and block the forward movement of the humeral head, and upper one-third subscapular augmentation can further compress the contact between the bone graft and the glenoid, which is conducive to bone healing without affecting rotation of the shoulder. please explain and give references the whole paper and study has a good concept The paper must justify the advantages of iliac crest graft over coracoid process with adequate references The abstract, methods and discussion needs modification to improve the language and clearly justify use of iliac crest graft over coracoid process .The paper should also provide adequate evidence and recommendations for justification for this procedure Paper needs major revision



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568 **E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com https://www.wjgnet.com

## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 75828

Title: Arthroscopy with subscapularis upper one-third tenodesis for treatment of

recurrent anterior shoulder instability independent of glenoid bone loss

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03999237 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: MS

**Professional title:** Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-02-16

Reviewer chosen by: Chen-Chen Gao

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-06-19 00:47

Reviewer performed review: 2022-07-03 12:23

**Review time:** 14 Days and 11 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [ Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [ Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous



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

I have gone through the revised manuscript and I suggest that the language, grammar and spelling needs to be modified after which the article can be accepted.