

## ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Orthopedics

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 10078

**Title:** Use of scoring systems for assessing and reporting the outcome results from shoulder surgery and arthroplasty

**Reviewer code:** 00502802

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2014-03-12 11:15

**Date reviewed:** 2014-04-19 15:17

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"/> Existing	<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"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I read with great interest the review of scoring systems for shoulder surgery. Even though the article is nicely written, I have some concerns: 1. Abstract is missing 2. References as mentioned in the text should be written as per the journals instructions. 3. In the text, instead of repeatedly writing "see below" please mention the Table no. 4. Certain references are missing 5. References: are repeated with different numbers of references. Kindly re-check 6. Certain other changes as suggested in the attached sheet.