



# 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:** 24752

**Title:** Antimicrobial technology in orthopedic and spinal implants

**Reviewer's code:** 00465176

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2016-02-14 14:10

**Date reviewed:** 2016-02-18 00:04

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 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 manuscript addresses an important topic where limited data exist. However the authors need to better summarize and integrate the available limited data from the literature. Rather than a passive summary of available studies summary tables are needed where all the methods are compared and in separate columns the authors comment on a) Level of evidence (in vitro, animal data, early clinical trials) b) Mechanism of action c) Advantages of one method vs the other d) Disadvantages of one methods vs the other The figures are nice but not sure how they help the reader. The legends are brief and do not really explain what the reader is seeing in many of the pictures.



# 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:** 24752

**Title:** Antimicrobial technology in orthopedic and spinal implants

**Reviewer's code:** 00546034

**Reviewer's country:** Canada

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2016-02-14 14:10

**Date reviewed:** 2016-02-24 09:23

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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input checked="" 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

This is an interesting review with some interest to the readers. However, before publication, the manuscript should be improved by the authors to include discussion related to each section. The discussion should highlight the pitfalls and hypothesis for improving these limitations, and then the challenges related to improve each suggested solution. The manuscript improvement is needed otherwise, it should be rejected.