

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 78681

**Title:** Modified nail and plate combination fixation for periprosthetic supracondylar femur fractures: two case reports

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05755592

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** FCPS, MBBS

**Professional title:** Assistant Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-07-10

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-07-16 11:23

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-07-23 06:24

**Review time:** 6 Days and 19 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

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

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors has described a modified technique which is combination of nailing and plate combination fixation for periprosthetic supracondylar femur fractures in elderly osteoporotic patients. The authors has also described its advantages. I am noted few short coming while reviewing the manuscript. Abstract and Introduction: looks good  
Case description: Needs further polishing. the surgical duration, hospital stay has not recorded of both procedures. Discussion: Is too lengthy needs brevity. The discussion should focus the comparison of this technique with the already common practiced techniques Over all language and grammar needs improvement

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 78681

**Title:** Modified nail and plate combination fixation for periprosthetic supracondylar femur fractures: two case reports

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05151649

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** DNB, MBBS, MNAMS

**Professional title:** Postdoctoral Fellow

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-07-10

**Reviewer chosen by:** Dong-Mei Wang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-08-22 07:43

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-08-23 05:36

**Review time:** 21 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

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

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you for the invite for the review. My observations. 1. The title, abstract and core tip are able to convey the message. 2. A distinction between "protected weight bearing" and "early weight bearing " needs to be made in the introduction section before the aim of the study is set. 3. The cases can be described as Case 1 and Case 2 as a whole. Describing all Case 1 features till follow up followed by Case 2. 4. The images of the implant should be provided. AND its biomechanics explained in a line figure. 5. Line 208. A summary of the comparative studies should be provided in a tabular form.