

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 50398

Title: Re-revision surgery for re-recurrent valgus deformity after revision total knee arthroplasty in a patient with a severe valgus deformity: A case report

Reviewer's code: 02703298

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's country: Turkey

Author's country: China

Reviewer chosen by: Ying Dou

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-07-22 07:52

Reviewer performed review: 2019-07-31 08:08

Review time: 9 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

I have assessed the paper with the name of "The re-revision surgery for re-recurrent valgus deformity after revision total knee arthroplasty in a patient with a severe valgus deformity: a case report. " My opinions are as follows; Title: Main idea is clear and understandable. Abstract: Abstract is readable. Introduction: Previous pertinent literature cited and discussed. Therefore, introduction is adequate. Methods: Case description is appropriate. Discussion: Discussion is sufficient. References: References are updated and accurate. Also references are relevant and comprehensive.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No