

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Orthopedics*

Manuscript NO: 83803

Title: Subtalar dislocations: Mechanisms, clinical presentation and methods of reduction

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05539060

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, MSc

Professional title: Director, Doctor, Lecturer, Senior Researcher

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Iran

Author's Country/Territory: United Kingdom

Manuscript submission date: 2023-02-09

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-03-03 11:51

Reviewer performed review: 2023-03-11 22:40

Review time: 8 Days and 10 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 Grade E: Do not publish |
| 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 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 type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input checked="" 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

Dear authors, I hope you are doing well. The paper reads well and I think could be accepted with some conditions: 1. The title is not common as you yourselves have mentioned in the your manuscript. So, I do not think if the paper could be among the priorities of WJO. 2. A recent paper has been published with the same topic and your paper doesn't add that much practical items to the literature. https://journals.lww.com/jaaosglobal/Fulltext/2021/12000/Subtalar_Dislocations.14.aspx?context=LatestArticles Another previous paper is published in somewhere else too: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s00264-015-2910-8> 3. Your epidemiological section is weak. There is no comparison between males and females and the references for incidence rate are not valid (references 7 and 8). I recommend you to review the papers evaluating different patterns and characteristics of Talar injuries and mention the combinations of subtalar dislocations with type of Talar fractures. This would shed a light on how the orthopedic/foot and ankle surgeons should be suspicious to find the subtalar dislocation.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Orthopedics*

Manuscript NO: 83803

Title: Subtalar dislocations: Mechanisms, clinical presentation and methods of reduction

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited 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: United Kingdom

Manuscript submission date: 2023-02-09

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-04-04 14:18

Reviewer performed review: 2023-04-04 15:15

Review time: 1 Hour

| | |
|---|--|
| 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 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 |
| Re-review | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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

There are at least 2 instances where A to E assessment is mentioned, but it is never defined.