

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS manuscript NO: 31500

Title: Total hip arthroplasty in patients with Paget's disease of bone: A systematic review

Reviewer's code: 02444729

Reviewer's country: Greece

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-11-23 12:17

Date reviewed: 2016-11-23 13:01

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 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 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 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

In this systematic review that included 8 studies, 358 hips (247 cemented THAs (69%), 105 uncemented THAs (29%) and 6 hybrid THAs (2%)), the authors determined functional outcome, complications and revision rates of THA in patients with Paget's disease. The studies reported significant improvement in hip function following THA. There was reported septic loosening (5%) at a mean of 8.6 years, in the uncemented THAs (3%) at a mean of 15.3 years, in the cemented group (6%) at a mean of 7.5 years ($P = 0.2052$). There were 27 revisions in the 358 cases (8%) occurring at a mean of 7 years. Six revisions occurred in the uncemented cohort (6%) at a mean of 8.6 years and 21 in the cemented cohort (9%) at a mean of 6.5 years ($P = 0.5117$). The conclusion in this review was that the use of THA in patients with Paget's disease with hip arthropathy is recommended. The post-operative functional outcome is largely similar to other patients; however, the revision rate is higher with aseptic loosening being the most common reason for revision. Uncemented implants appear to be associated with a lower failure rate. The issue of Paget disease and THA failure is a challenge for hip surgeons. Preoperative planning with administration of biphosphantes seems to



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>

decrease intraoperative bleeding and thus intraoperative complications. The rates of failure are similar or even little higher compared with THA in normal individuals. Nice study with accurate selection/exclusion chart, sound statistics and clear cut results.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS manuscript NO: 31500

Title: Total hip arthroplasty in patients with Paget's disease of bone: A systematic review

Reviewer's code: 00054174

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-11-23 12:17

Date reviewed: 2016-11-23 23:44

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 type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Comments to the Author: Thanks for invitation of the Journal. I am very glad to review this manuscript. This a systematic review on total hip arthroplasty in patients with Paget's disease of bone. The Introduction is well written and convincing. This systematic review seems to be highly original and no systematic review currently exists on this topic; thus, this manuscript is timely. However, the Method seems to be simply and somewhat unreasonable. Similar phenomenon is found for Result. Specific points: Page 3, line 49: "...resorption with subsequent..." it will be better if "with" can be revised to "and". Page 3, line 56: "It is thought to results from..." "results" should be "result". Page 5, line 101-106: Is this systematic review accordance with PRISMA statement? Presenting keywords only seems to be insufficient. Can you kindly give your search strategy in more detail (example: PMID 27655589)? -it will be more reliable. Do you contact original author(s) to obtain more information? Please clarify. Page 5, line 108-111: According to Cochrane Handbook for systematic review, eligibility criteria should be present in the form of PICOS. Please modify. Page 5, line 113-117: As for Data extraction, only first extracted data. It seems to be questionable. Page 6, line



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>

130-133: why are there results for quality assessment? I did not find any description for quality assessment in Method, and what's tool you employed? Please add some contents regarding quality assessment in Method. Page 16, Figure 1: Can you briefly describe the reasons for exclusion in Flow chart? As this study is a systematic review, why "studies included in quantitative synthesis (n=8)"? Please clarify. In addition, can you describe some limitations of this systematic review in Discussion?

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS manuscript NO: 31500

Title: Total hip arthroplasty in patients with Paget's disease of bone: A systematic review

Reviewer's code: 01200726

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-11-23 12:17

Date reviewed: 2016-11-25 22:27

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 checked="" 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

The present study reviewed the results of total hip arthroplasty in patients with Paget's disease. The post-operative functional outcome is largely similar to other patients; however, the revision rate is higher with aseptic loosening. Could the authors emphasize the difference of the outcome between cementless and cemented total hip arthroplasty? It would be better to add a table concerning complications.