

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 69909

Title: Amputation stump management: A narrative review

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05261629

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: South Korea

Manuscript submission date: 2021-07-16

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-07-24 06:14

Reviewer performed review: 2021-07-24 06:22

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

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

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

It is a simple but interesting and concise narrative review

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 69909

Title: Amputation stump management: A narrative review

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05571715

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Academic Fellow, Associate Chief Physician, Doctor, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: South Korea

Manuscript submission date: 2021-07-16

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-07-24 13:51

Reviewer performed review: 2021-08-02 13:24

Review time: 8 Days and 23 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I would like to first acknowledge the authors to provide an overview of the basic methods for the management of amputation stumps. 1. Generally, the major causes of upper and lower limb amputations are different. Are there any different or special management for those two amputation stumps? Furthermore, the postoperative managements for minor amputation (eg., finger, toe) and major amputation (eg., below or above knee) may also be different. Please clarify. 2. As mentioned in the Coretip and Abstract, phantom sensation is one of the postoperative complications after amputation surgery. However, this manuscript did not review in this field. It would be useful to review the procedures to eliminate or minimize postoperative phantom; for example, mirror therapy. 3. The authors review 4 representative shrinkage and shaping methods after amputation. What are the advantages and disadvantages of each method? Please discuss separately following each paragraph. 4. Since this manuscript is a review article, it would be necessary to describe current problems or weaknesses in the management of amputation stumps, as well as to clarify future directions in the following study. 5. As a review article, 17 references seem to be not enough. Please provide more contemporary references.