



# 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

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 27815

**Title:** Evaluation of a chitosan-polyethylene glycol paste as a local antibiotic delivery device

**Reviewer's code:** 00503412

**Reviewer's country:** Italy

**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2016-06-19 07:45

**Date reviewed:** 2016-06-22 17:05

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input 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

The paper is of interest and well-organized. The aims and objectives are clear, the hypothesis is sound and the data are well presented. The abstract, although too long, well reflects the content of the article. The introduction describes what the author hoped to achieve accurately, and clearly states the problem being investigated. Experimental procedures are carried out with rigorous and adequate competence. The paper should be of interest to scientists working in this field as well as others with closely related research interests. Finally, the article is sufficiently novel and interesting to warrant the present publication.



# 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

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 27815

**Title:** Evaluation of a chitosan-polyethylene glycol paste as a local antibiotic delivery device

**Reviewer's code:** 00505434

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2016-06-19 07:45

**Date reviewed:** 2016-07-10 20:54

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 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"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<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 a well-thought out and well conducted study, however there are some limitations, such as moderately innovative, short time period of in vivo testing, and the animal model is not ideal for orthopaedic condition. I would recommend authors to rewrite the abstract section to make it shorter but concise and clearly communicate the major findings from the study, no detailed experiments should be included. The authors did not discuss why only Vancomycin and Amikacin (and their concentration) were used for the study, please provide a short paragraph (in the introduction section) to state the reasons for this. Figure 7 is not necessary, I recommend to remove it from the manuscript. Finally I would like to congratulate the authors for conducting this important study which has the potential for clinical translation of the technology and for treatment of a challenging clinical problem.