

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 76648

**Title:** Complication of lengthening and the role of post-operative care, physical and psychological rehabilitation among fibula hemimelia

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05866874

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Physiotherapist, Professor, Senior Lecturer

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Spain

**Author's Country/Territory:** Iran

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-03-23

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-03-30 08:18

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-03-30 08:46

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No



**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

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] Anonymous [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] No
-------------------------------------	---

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Dear authors: Thank you very much for the presentation of your research, it is a great job you have done, but I suggest the following indications: - In the section of introduction and development of the different techniques to treat HF you should introduce dates (year) to the different approaches that have been given throughout history. Although you cite the reference, it is better to include the year, so that the reader does not have to see it in the reference section. - They allude to physiotherapy treatment techniques, today there is a consensus and scientific evidence that one of the best treatments is dry needling on the trigger point of the spasmed muscle, please make reference to this technique and its advantages. - In the statement "the role of continuous passive movement is still unknown", there are numerous articles that provide a benefit and evidence to passive mobility in different segments, please review and provide references in this regard. - In the subluxation/dislocation section you should refer to the rule that if there is a body segment with a hypomobility (deficit of movement), the nearest segment (joint) will assume that deficit creating a hypermobility (increased movement, and therefore the possibility of subluxation) thus creating a compensatory mechanism automatically and involuntarily by the patient. Otherwise, I congratulate you on your writing and for having done such a good job. Best regards

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 76648

**Title:** Complication of lengthening and the role of post-operative care, physical and psychological rehabilitation among fibula hemimelia

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05207387

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** DSc, PhD

**Professional title:** Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** South Korea

**Author's Country/Territory:** Iran

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-03-23

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-03-30 05:19

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-04-01 10:17

**Review time:** 2 Days and 4 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**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

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: [ <b>Y</b> ] Anonymous [ ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [ <b>Y</b> ] No
-------------------------------------	---

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Thanks for recommending me as a reviewer. In this mini review paper, authors reviewed the literature to find the current post-operative care and rehabilitation programs during and after limb lengthening and reconstruction. The research is overall well written. If authors complete minor revisions, the quality of the study will be further improved. 1. The introduction section is well written. However, a paragraph cannot consist of a single sentence. I suggest that the authors combine the last paragraph of the introduction section with the previous one. 2. Conclusion section is too short. If the authors made the conclusion section more specific, it would be helpful for readers to understand.