

## ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Meta-Analysis

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 14642

**Title:** Operative versus nonoperative treatment of displaced intra-articular calcaneal fracture: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials

**Reviewer code:** 00074337

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2014-10-18 12:45

**Date reviewed:** 2014-11-08 23:44

| CLASSIFICATION                              | LANGUAGE EVALUATION  | RECOMMENDATION                      | CONCLUSION   |
|---|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing                | Google Search:                      | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept                        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing           | <input type="checkbox"/> Existing   | <input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good      | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> No records | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair      | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected                           | BPG Search:                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor      |  | <input type="checkbox"/> Existing   | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision                |
|   |  | <input type="checkbox"/> No records |  |

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a well written meta-analysis which confirms with PRISMA guidelines. I only have two small comments: 1. There should be an explanation provided as to why conclusions were different from historical meta-analysis 2. Heading sensibility should read sensitivity

## ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Meta-Analysis

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 14642

**Title:** Operative versus nonoperative treatment of displaced intra-articular calcaneal fracture: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials

**Reviewer code:** 00729478

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2014-10-18 12:45

**Date reviewed:** 2014-11-25 02:09

| CLASSIFICATION   | LANGUAGE EVALUATION  | RECOMMENDATION                      | CONCLUSION   |
|--|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing     | Google Search:                      | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good            | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing           | <input type="checkbox"/> Existing   | <input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> No records | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected                           | BPG Search:                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor                 |  | <input type="checkbox"/> Existing   | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision                |
|  |  | <input type="checkbox"/> No records |  |

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

General: Interesting topic, very well presented. Flow of language: acceptable Title: suitable Text structure and content: both are adequate The reference list: adequate.