

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 71261

**Title:** Effects of evidence-based intervention on postoperative fear, compliance, and self-efficacy in elderly patients with hip fracture

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05458840

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Egypt

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-12-05

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-12-13 08:30

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-12-13 09:54

**Review time:** 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: [ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] Anonymous [ <input type="radio"/> ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ <input type="radio"/> ] Yes [ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] No
-------------------------------------	---

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript written by Ying Fu et al. evaluates the effects of evidence-based intervention on postoperative fear, compliance, and self-efficacy in elderly patients with hip fractures. Evidence-based nursing is a new nursing model that takes clinical nursing problems as the starting point and solves problems in an evidence-based manner. This study is of value to assist the hip fracture rehabilitation effect in elderly patients. Very interesting study. And the manuscript is well written. The experiment of the study is designed very well, aims are very clear. Methods are reasonable. Data in tables are very good, and well discussed. Thank you for giving opportunity to review your study.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 71261

**Title:** Effects of evidence-based intervention on postoperative fear, compliance, and self-efficacy in elderly patients with hip fracture

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05839376

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Assistant Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** United Kingdom

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-12-05

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-12-13 08:31

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-12-13 09:55

**Review time:** 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: [ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] Anonymous [ <input type="radio"/> ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ <input type="radio"/> ] Yes [ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] No
-------------------------------------	---

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

In this retrospective study, the authors investigate the effects of evidence-based intervention on postoperative fear, compliance, and self-efficacy in 120 elderly patients with hip fractures. The study is set up correctly. The material studied allows to draw the conclusions. The paper is written well, the Introduction give a good overview about the study background. The description of material studied is accurate. The specific content of Basic rehabilitation intervention and Evidence-based nursing interventions are described in detail, which achieves the purpose of the research. The evaluation indicators of the study are rich enough to draw conclusions. The Results are presented clearly and have been discussed well.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 71261

**Title:** Effects of evidence-based intervention on postoperative fear, compliance, and self-efficacy in elderly patients with hip fracture

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 00503228

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Iran

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-12-05

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-12-15 07:15

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-12-16 14:42

**Review time:** 1 Day and 7 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
-------------------------------------	---

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

It is a good study, though there are some minor limitations. Firstly it is not a randomized trial, and therefore those who doesn't admit to get into the intervention group got classified in the control. It has the limitation that such people might be in worse psychological conditions or overall life situation, and that may make some bias to the study. Secondly, you just did the routine nursing for the controls, and the differences you've observed in favor of the intervention group might be not specifically to the procedures or information and rehabilitation to the intervention group, but simply due to the higher attention by the nursing, especially in this age group it might have huge effect on any individual. A better approach was to pay the same nursing overall attention to the control group, without the specialized educations and rehabilitation. Minor revisions: abstract "self-efficacy score were significantly higher in the intervention group than in the conventional group (all  $P > 0.05$ )" you meant  $p < 0.05$  right? - t value is wrong. "t statistics" is right