

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Orthopedics*

**Manuscript NO:** 82859

**Title:** Achieving High Union Rates after First Metatarsophalangeal Joint Arthrodesis:  
Radiographic Outcomes and Technical Pitfalls

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05213310

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Adjunct Professor, Full Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Saudi Arabia

**Author's Country/Territory:** Switzerland

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-12-28

**Reviewer chosen by:** Dong-Mei Wang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-03-04 08:50

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-03-04 20:00

**Review time:** 11 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 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

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<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 scientific significance
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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

1. The study's title should be changed to reflect the goal for which the current study was designed. In addition, the new title should be free of abbreviations and no longer than twenty words, as this is one of the characteristics of a distinguished title in research. 2. Considering that the most important findings of the current study are included in the results section of the study abstract without extravagance. 3. The current study's introduction is very brief and insufficient to fulfill the role of the introduction, which is where you explain briefly and clearly why you are writing the paper. The introduction provides enough context for the reader to understand and evaluate the experiment you conducted. It also provides justification for the study. It was suggested that the introduction be limited to three paragraphs, with the final paragraph highlighting the research problem and how to address it within the framework of the current study's objective. 4. What are the references or previous studies on which the researcher relied in support of the surgical technique, postoperative protocol, and radiological assessment? This deficiency must be addressed. 5. It is critical to review the progress of the current study's results, as I noticed that the statistical method that was explained in detail in the



**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>

methods section was not fully followed in the results section, particularly in Tables 1 and 2. 6. One of the final sections of a research paper is the discussion section, in which the author describes, analyzes, and interprets their findings. The discussion section explains the significance of the study results and how they relate to the research question (s). This description is not adequately achieved in the current paper; please review and revise. 7. Dedicate the final paragraph of the discussion section to highlighting the current study's strengths and weaknesses, as well as answering the question, What are the current study's future directions? 8. Rewrite the study's conclusion to demonstrate whether the current research problem has been solved in another way. Is the current study's goal achieved? 9. The references used are very old and not recent, and their number is insignificant in comparison to the significance of the current study. I hope to replace old references with new ones beginning in 2015 and beyond. 10. Does the percentage of plagiarism correspond to what is permitted by the journal's policies? Good luck,

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Orthopedics*

**Manuscript NO:** 82859

**Title:** Achieving High Union Rates after First Metatarsophalangeal Joint Arthrodesis:  
Radiographic Outcomes and Technical Pitfalls

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05679676

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** United States

**Author's Country/Territory:** Switzerland

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-12-28

**Reviewer chosen by:** Geng-Long Liu

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-03-13 11:52

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-03-14 15:06

**Review time:** 1 Day and 3 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

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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

In the abstract, it is listed as 71/72 fusion rate, but percentage is based off of 70/72 (97.2%)

## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Orthopedics*

**Manuscript NO:** 82859

**Title:** Achieving High Union Rates after First Metatarsophalangeal Joint Arthrodesis:  
Radiographic Outcomes and Technical Pitfalls

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05213310

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Adjunct Professor, Full Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Saudi Arabia

**Author's Country/Territory:** Switzerland

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-12-28

**Reviewer chosen by:** Jia-Ru Fan

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-04-17 13:13

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-04-17 13:47

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Peer-reviewer</b>	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**

Yes, I found a file titled "82859-Answering-Reviewers-revision.docx" that answers the reviewers' directives for the research team in the paper, but the other file titled "82859\_Auto\_Edited.docx" doesn't explain what was done. I hope the author(s) would highlight the paper's revisions in "yellow color" or "add comments" on the Word file "82859\_Auto\_Edited.docx" to make follow-up easier to follow up on actually added edits.

//Good Luck//