

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS manuscript NO: 8281

Title: Severe Bone Loss of the Proximal Femur. Update on Reconstructive Options

Reviewer code: 02444715

Science editor: Su-Xin Gou

Date sent for review: 2013-12-25 09:12

Date reviewed: 2013-12-27 03:10

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"/> Existing	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Comments World Journal of Orthopedics 8281 Severe Bone Loss of the Proximal Femur. Update on Reconstructive Options The title need to clarify that the topic is about arthroplasty revision, not post traumatic bone loss or after tumor surgery Title : the word sever has no significance The paper need linguistic English review The abstract put the aim of the study is: review of the current literature aiming to assess an algorithmic approach for reconstruction of each different type of bone defect.! The authors need to put a graph showing this proposed algorithm to help the reader to follow this in clinical practice Classification need to put a figure to explain to the reader different types The authors need to put an example of a CT & MRI pictures to show the significance of such investigations in planning The authors need to put in the proposed algorithm the choice of reconstruction including prosthesis type and bone reconstruction proposed for each level of defect

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS manuscript NO: 8281

Title: Severe Bone Loss of the Proximal Femur. Update on Reconstructive Options

Reviewer code: 00505420

Science editor: Su-Xin Gou

Date sent for review: 2013-12-25 09:12

Date reviewed: 2013-12-31 07:56

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"/> Existing	<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"/> Existing	<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

Severe Bone Loss of the Proximal Femur. Update on Reconstructive Options Few suggestions:
 Title: -Delete the word 'severe' as the authors are describing cases with mild to moderate bone loss as well (Type I and II). -Also include the phrase 'revision total hip arthroplasty' as that's what the focus is in this article. Introduction: -Please include infection as a cause as most of the presented examples are infection related Classification: -Please tabulate the various classification systems - Please critically evaluate each system with practical drawbacks Preop planning: -Need to elaborate more on this. The authors just enumerate the various radiologic modalities. What to see, how to differentiate.....? - Cemented vs uncemented Reconstructive options: -I like the way the authors have described the various reconstructive options based on the classification. The authors need to elaborate on cemented vs uncemented options. - Rationale for various options based on bone loss and fixation options - Pl tabulate the clinical results in literature based on different options: cemented vs uncemented, impaction grafting, proximally coated, fully coated, Tapered, allograft prosthetic composite (APC), hydroxyapatite coating, proximal femoral etc etc - The authors recommend immunologic match for allograft? How practical is this and do the authors do it on a routine? - Extensive discussion of APC as compared to other options? Looks more of a review article on APC

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS manuscript NO: 8281

Title: Severe Bone Loss of the Proximal Femur. Update on Reconstructive Options

Reviewer code: 00503904

Science editor: Su-Xin Gou

Date sent for review: 2013-12-25 09:12

Date reviewed: 2014-01-19 19:20

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"/> Existing	<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"/> Existing	<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

This is an interesting review on the several reconstructive options for management of bone loss of the proximal femur. To improve the quality of the manuscript, I recommend an extensive revision of the English usage and grammar.

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS manuscript NO: 8281

Title: Severe Bone Loss of the Proximal Femur. Update on Reconstructive Options

Reviewer code: 02444802

Science editor: Su-Xin Gou

Date sent for review: 2013-12-25 09:12

Date reviewed: 2014-01-28 18:14

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"/> Existing	<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"/> No records	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This paper reports on the main findings of recent relevant surgical techniques / clinic outcomes however does not discuss the literature cited well at all. therefore the context of the paper is weak and offers little new / important information to the reader.