

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS Manuscript NO: 6103

Title: Hallux Rigidus - Joint Preserving Alternatives to Arthrodesis: A Review of the Literature

Reviewer code: 00505402

Science editor: Qi, Yuan

Date sent for review: 2013-10-02 20:53

Date reviewed: 2013-10-04 04:33

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	language polishing	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Adding some illustration figures will help reader better understand the manuscript.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS Manuscript NO: 6103

Title: Hallux Rigidus – Joint Preserving Alternatives to Arthrodesis: A Review of the Literature

Reviewer code: 00505398

Science editor: Qi, Yuan

Date sent for review: 2013-10-02 20:53

Date reviewed: 2013-10-04 06:38

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"/> Existed	<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	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I wish we had line numbers Abstract: sentence(S)6 recommend(R) Numerous classifications makes comparison of differnt studies difficult. S 8 change(C) best to most S 10 R Different motion preserving & joint sacrificing operations. S 11 & 12 R joint & motion preserving Core tip: S 1 change(C) relief to relieve S 5 when procedure fails to relieve symptoms, performance of arthrodesis after resection of the joint is difficult and... S 6 joint & motion preserving osteotomies are also of interest.S 7 joint & motion preserving Introduction S 1 & rest of paper change (MTP) to(MTPJ) Radiographic findings: S 3 With advancement Arthrodesis S 2 joint & motion Chielectomy: S 3 Change aggravated to more difficult Moberg: should leave out S 11 The peak ... since this sentence is controversial & without reference Waterman Green needs figure Youngswick S 4 Further it tries to plantar translate the 1st metatarsal head which may decrease metatarsalgia & dorsal impingement. 2nd Para s 6 This makes interpretation of these results difficult.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS Manuscript NO: 6103

Title: Hallux Rigidus – Joint Preserving Alternatives to Arthrodesis: A Review of the Literature

Reviewer code: 00501335

Science editor: Qi, Yuan

Date sent for review: 2013-10-02 20:53

Date reviewed: 2013-10-07 00:51

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" 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"/> Existed	<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 type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Editor, dear Authors This is great work, congratulations. No suggestions other than accept as it is. best regards vs

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS Manuscript NO: 6103

Title: Hallux Rigidus – Joint Preserving Alternatives to Arthrodesis: A Review of the Literature

Reviewer code: 00503848

Science editor: Qi, Yuan

Date sent for review: 2013-10-02 20:53

Date reviewed: 2013-10-15 15:01

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"/> Existed	<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	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Editor, Thank you for reviewing this well written and well illustrated overview on Joint Preserving Alternatives to Arthrodesis for hallux rigidus. I have some comments/questions which should be solved before publication is possible. 1. Why did the authors not perform a systematic review so the readers know all techniques and all results are included? Now there is risk of bias in this narrative review. 2. A table with the results (ROM, VAS, complications,...) has added value to this manuscript so the readers can compare the results of the different techniques. 3. Another word for hallux rigidus is hallux limitus. Is a metatarsus primus elevates another word for hallux rigidus or the consequence of hallux rigidus? 4. The authors do not discuss the incidence of hallux rigidus in general population. 5. The authors summarize the classifications. Do these classifications help in guiding treatment or prognosis? Are these really relevant? 6. Is a short/tight Achilles tendon a predictor or a consequence of a hallux rigidus? 7. The diagnosis is discussed but no words about the differential diagnosis, which other diagnosis can be mimic the symptoms of hallux rigidus? 8. Is an osteotomy helpful when the problem is a tight flexor hallucis tendon, what should be done then? How to diagnose a tight tendon? 9. There is no real discussion of the article and the authors repeat every paragraph that there is a low level of evidence with a low grade of recommendation.