

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Orthopedics*

Manuscript NO: 82854

Title: The use of topical vancomycin powder in total joint arthroplasty: Why the current literature is inconsistent?

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06257040

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Uganda

Author's Country/Territory: Australia

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-28

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-12-30 17:04

Reviewer performed review: 2023-01-08 08:15

Review time: 8 Days and 15 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 Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

As a commentary review paper, it has great insights into inconclusive recommendations drawn by other authors on Prosthetic joint infections in Orthopedics. however, the methodology section is lacking in great details about the different methods used by various methods used by different authors. Also, please use " Grammarly" to improve the manuscript's grammar.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Orthopedics*

Manuscript NO: 82854

Title: The use of topical vancomycin powder in total joint arthroplasty: Why the current literature is inconsistent?

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 04389493

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Adjunct Professor, Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: Australia

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-28

Reviewer chosen by: Yu-Lu Chen

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-02-08 18:12

Reviewer performed review: 2023-02-16 10:13

Review time: 7 Days and 16 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
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
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: <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

Dear Authors, It was a pleasure to review your paper titled “The use of topical vancomycin powder in total joint arthroplasty. Why the current literature is inconsistent”. The paper addresses an actual topic, it depicts a clear image and provides the right instruments to understand the actual situation about VP usage in TJA surgery. The abstract should be better structured. Introduction, Material and Methods, Results, Discussion, Conclusion... Current methods section does not make sense. It is not clear which papers met the review inclusion criteria. How many papers were found as a result of the search using specific terms? The authors should describe these results using a chart. Check the manuscript for grammar and punctuation errors, there are a few throughout the article. Moreover, better specify the period of interest in which the articles you included in your review are drawn. I think there are at least 2 articles published at the end of 2022. I hope you manage to publish your work. Best regards