



**ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 20187

**Title:** Controversies in management of slipped capital femoral epiphysis

**Reviewer's code:** 02903665

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2015-06-01 11:34

**Date reviewed:** 2015-06-07 06:00

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**

The authors provide an overview of SCFE for the readership. There is nothing new here but the authors provide a succinct review of the state of the art in SCFE. I would mention that no study supports the Dunn procedure over simple pinning of the hip. Between the groups in Boston and those in Phila, there is a vast difference in outcomes of the Dunn procedure. It is unclear if it prevents AVN in the setting of an unstable slip. It is currently not standard of care, and is technically difficult, and probably not a procedure that can or should be performed by any pediatric orthopedist. The second paragraph is a bit confusing. Are the authors referring to a healed slip? In the paragraph considering non-anatomic reconstructions (south wick etc), they mention "good" outcomes. What are these outcomes? Are they short or long term? What is the risk (percent) of iatrogenic AVN in cervical osteotomies, what do the authors recommend? My feeling is the safer operation is southwick in hands that are not experienced with intra articular osteotomies. What is the authors preference in terms of contralateral fixation, the authors only touch on this, but it is a huge debate, what factors are important to them?



# 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:** 20187

**Title:** Controversies in management of slipped capital femoral epiphysis

**Reviewer's code:** 01220036

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2015-06-01 11:34

**Date reviewed:** 2015-06-26 22:23

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 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 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

Good observations



# 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:** 20187

**Title:** Controversies in management of slipped capital femoral epiphysis

**Reviewer's code:** 01221818

**Reviewer's country:** Italy

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2015-06-01 11:34

**Date reviewed:** 2015-07-03 01:06

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"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		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

Dear Editor, here are the comments and reviews for the paper entitled "Controversies in management of Slipped Capital Femoral Epiphysis". The paper elucidate the current therapeutic approaches for Slipped Capital Femoral Epiphysis (SCFE). In literature, the surgical reduction of the slip is related to the concept of "stability". As pointed out by one researcher (T. Slongo) cited in this paper, differences between the clinical classification and the intraoperative findings are often present, suggesting that the clinical evaluation and the traditional classification systems of SCFE are not always reliable to estimate the real stability of the epiphysis. Please add a paragraph about this topic. Specific comments: References should be formatted according to journal's guidelines



# 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:** 20187

**Title:** Controversies in management of slipped capital femoral epiphysis

**Reviewer's code:** 02444693

**Reviewer's country:** Australia

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2015-06-01 11:34

**Date reviewed:** 2015-07-07 15:23

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"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		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

Good editorial.