

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

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 86424

Title: Rotationplasty type BIIIb as an effective alternative to limb salvage procedure in

adults: Two case reports

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05395420 Position: Editorial Board Academic degree: DNB, MS

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-06-18

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-06-22 14:56

Reviewer performed review: 2023-06-26 11:28

Review time: 3 Days and 20 Hours

[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C:
Good
[] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No novelty
[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair
[] Grade D: No creativity or innovation



Baishideng

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

https://www.wjgnet.com

[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair
[] Grade D: No scientific significance
[] Grade A: Priority publishing [] Grade B: Minor language polishing [Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
[] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [] Rejection
[Y] Yes [] No
Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Authors Congratulations on the presented case report I suggest you improve the submission on the following grounds to be considered for publication 1. The language of the manuscript needs an thorough revision with the help of native language expert 2. The abstract conclusion presented the procedure only for infection which is not the case hence revise it 3. The introduction need some logical sequence of presentation to make it interesting to the readers 4. The procedure for both the cases need to detailed more elaborately 5. The preoperative scores need to be compared with the postoperative scores to make it meaningful 6. The discussion need to elaborate more on the validity of the procedure and the other alternate available options to be considered apart from rotationplasty