

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 67627

**Title:** Quadrilateral plate fractures of the acetabulum: Classification, approach, implant therapy and related research progress

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 04247363

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** DDS, PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** France

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-04-28

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-06-22 04:25

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-07-08 02:49

**Review time:** 15 Days and 22 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 Grade E: Do not publish
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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: [ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] Anonymous [ <input type="radio"/> ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ <input type="radio"/> ] Yes [ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] No
-------------------------------------	---

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Authors / Editor We have read with interest your manuscript about Acetabulum fractures, focused on classification clarification and overview of surgical procedures. The subject is well documented, and the manuscript offers a clear overview of both classifications and treatments issues. To our point of view, the manuscript is worth publishing. However, we'd ask for some minor revisions, in order to clarify some aspects of the manuscript. (1) Introduction/Plan : this section explains clearly the problematics, but we hardly see how you're going to develop the manuscript. It'd of interest to announce the sections that will be explored in the manuscript. It is unclear if your manuscript has 3 sections (Classification - Operative Approach - Discussion) or 7 sections. (2) Classification: As for the Surgical Techniques, an additional Table summarizing the different classifications (with their limitations) would help understanding. (3) Side remarks: > Figures: Fig.2 legend indicates Yellow circle and Red arrow, but these elements are not visible on the pictures. Fig.3 is noted Fig.4 in Figures Legend In "Screw-Plate System Internal Fixation" section, authors' names are written in uppercasse.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 67627

**Title:** Quadrilateral plate fractures of the acetabulum: Classification, approach, implant therapy and related research progress

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 03072151

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, MSc

**Professional title:** Associate Professor, Attending Doctor, Surgeon

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Taiwan

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-04-28

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-07-09 10:32

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-07-09 12:17

**Review time:** 1 Hour

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
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

<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

Dear editor and authors, The authors reviewed the clinical pitfalls of the Quadrilateral Plate (QP) fractures of the acetabulum. The authors did a really good job on literature searching and explaining as simply as possible but including always all the relevant information about each topic on the text. This makes it quite valuable for clinical professionals. However, the aim and focus of the review is not clearly presented by the authors. The authors should normally state their aims at end of Introduction. The review does not seem to be systematic which presents a big flaw. A narrative review needs a better structure to avoid confusions to the readers. The authors need to navigate better their focus of the manuscript and do it in a more systematic way, with better structure. I would suggest re-numbering the subtitles as follows: 1. Introduction 2. Definition and Classification 3. Operative Approach 3.1. Implant Internal Fixation Technique 3.2. Kirschner Wire and Screw Fixation 3.3. Screw-Plate System Internal Fixation 3.4. Wire Cerclage Technique 5. Discussion 6. Conclusion A review should be more than a compilation of the results reported in the literature. It should in fact be a critical assessment of the present knowledge with some clear conclusions what all these results mean. Table 2 did a good job. However, classification of QP fractures should also be summarized for clarification. Nevertheless, the review is missing a section on the potential future perspectives regarding the topic. Please add a paragraph in Discussion to express your own opinions and comments on the future directions. Finally, the figure legends are confusing. The description in Figure 2 cannot be found in the figure. Figure 3 is wrongly numbered as 4.