

## ESPS Peer-review Report

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

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 1840

**Title:** Ponseti Method Compared with Soft-Tissue Release for the Management of Clubfoot: A Meta-Analysis

**Reviewer code:** 00646697

**Science editor:** Huang, Xin-Zhen

**Date sent for review:** 2013-01-09 14:22

**Date reviewed:** 2013-01-11 03:50

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[ Y ] Grade A (Excellent)	[ Y ] Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	[ Y ] Accept
[ ] Grade B (Very good)	[ ] Grade B: minor language polishing	[ ] Existed	[ ] High priority for publication
[ ] Grade C (Good)	[ ] Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	[ ] No records	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade D (Fair)	[ ] Grade D: rejected	[ ] Existed	[ ] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E (Poor)		[ ] No records	[ ] Major revision

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear authors, I read with your interest your study. This is well written and well designed study and it is worth to published in the WJO. The authors have highlighted a very important topic and the outcomes will definitely benefit Kids with club feet. Minor Recommendations 1.Please insert the word “ Study” after A Meta-Analysis in the title. 2.In the background, expand and clearly define Ponseti method and highlight the basic outcomes of previous trials. 3.I would highly encourage the authors to include a figure and list all the specific angles of the foot. This will allow the reader to determine the exact anatomical location of each of the angles that were mentioned in page 4. 4.The way that the inclusion criteria were listed is unclear, why publication year and authors’ names are within the inclusion criteria. 5.Please define what do you mean by the Q test, have used the Q test to calculate the effect size. 6.Discussion is acceptable but I would recommend to shortening the paragraph in P12 and stayed focus on the main outcomes of the study. 7.Please highlight limitations of the study and future recommendations, as well as insert the term “Conclusions” before the last paragraph. 8.The quality of figures 1 and 3 needs to be improved.

## ESPS Peer-review Report

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

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 1840

**Title:** Ponseti Method Compared with Soft-Tissue Release for the Management of Clubfoot: A Meta-Analysis

**Reviewer code:** 02444787

**Science editor:** Huang, Xin-Zhen

**Date sent for review:** 2013-01-09 14:22

**Date reviewed:** 2013-01-21 21:54

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existed	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Well-written paper but some minor revisions should be done: 1- Tables are a little bit confusing and should be simplified. Table legends should be more descriptive. 2- Figure 4 should be removed. 3- Discussion part should be shortened and be more clear. Some unnecessary common knowledge especially on page 11 first paragraph should be removed.

## ESPS Peer-review Report

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

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 1840

**Title:** Ponseti Method Compared with Soft-Tissue Release for the Management of Clubfoot: A Meta-Analysis

**Reviewer code:** 02444795

**Science editor:** Huang, Xin-Zhen

**Date sent for review:** 2013-01-09 14:22

**Date reviewed:** 2013-02-05 03:26

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existed	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The paper needs to accept that the results are by nature going to be of low scientific value given the grade of studies used and the relatively loose entry criteria. This must be stated clearly in the discussion.