

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"/> 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

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?

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

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 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 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

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

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"/> 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

Good editorial.