

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS manuscript NO: 26002

Title: Windsurfing vs kitesurfing: Injuries at the North Sea over a 2-year period

Reviewer's code: 03068027

Reviewer's country: United Kingdom

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2016-03-30 17:21

Date reviewed: 2016-04-10 03:17

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

It is an interesting manuscript on investigating and comparing windsurf versus kite surf in the same conditions giving a description of the associated injuries. Overall the structure of the manuscript is very good and the language of the manuscript reaches the standard of publishing. One point requires some clarification: With regards to the subgroup analysis of the injury severity between the two groups. Please explain more on the conclusion that the injury severity was neither significantly different between the groups, nor associated with patient age, skills level or the use of protective gear. Do you have enough numbers in the subgroups to support this with confidence or could this or part of it be the case of statistic error type II?

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS manuscript NO: 26002

Title: Windsurfing vs kitesurfing: Injuries at the North Sea over a 2-year period

Reviewer's code: 02705018

Reviewer's country: Greece

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2016-03-30 17:21

Date reviewed: 2016-04-11 05:05

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This manuscript which compares windsurfing with kitesurfing injuries presents an overall well structured epidemiologic study. I propose publication, as I believe this work is an interesting approach to the extreme sports related trauma and also provides some new information about it.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS manuscript NO: 26002

Title: Windsurfing vs kitesurfing: Injuries at the North Sea over a 2-year period

Reviewer's code: 03067293

Reviewer's country: Spain

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2016-03-30 17:21

Date reviewed: 2016-04-19 01:27

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting and well written article on acute sports-related injuries in two modalities of watersports. I congratulate the authors for their initiative. These are my comments related to the manuscript: - In the running title perhaps it could be interesting add "injuries", because with only the names of these disciplines it is more generic! (or even acute injuries). - Respect the results, although you stated this in the discussion, it could be confusing consider the injury incidence rates, because you have only review a sample with injuries...so the rate always is higher than in a cohort of athletes of these disciplines). - In the manual searching of clinical cases of the 2 last year in database is possible that some cases did not have the label of windsurf or kitesurf. You should reflect it on limitations also. - Another doubt after read the manuscript is about the definition of injury. If you are registering injuries, what is considered "injury". In this case, I think you could specify that are only acute injuries treated in the hospital. For example, what about tendinopathies, or LBP episodes that were not consulted on their service? It should be clear that this study is referred to "acute injuries treated in the emergencies hospital setting" - When you are reporting incidence rates, it may be interesting to report also their confidence intervals to interpret it correctly. - It is striking to read other



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

incidence reports as McComack, who refers 0.22/1000h... - Respect the sentence in lines 322-324, I think that the existence of other similar results is not enough to support the validity of the results. Could you explain more about. - Thanks!