



**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>

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Orthopedics

**Manuscript NO:** 52602

**Title:** An observational study of a new modular femoral revision system

**Reviewer's code:** 03518304

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Research Fellow

**Reviewer's country:** Italy

**Author's country:** Denmark

**Manuscript submission date:** 2019-11-11

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-11-11 16:45

**Reviewer performed review:** 2019-11-12 08:16

**Review time:** 15 Hours

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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input 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:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

I have read this paper with interest. Well done. I would suggest some revisions. Need minor grammar checks. add some features about cup and bearing surfaces in the description Add some evaluation about the choice of the different stems It would be helpful to describe the reconstruction of the biomechanical parameters (offset, leg lenght), as it is one of the most important reason for choosing modular stem instead of single taper stem. It would be also very important to describe the reasons why you chose a BS instead of CS. Add some post-operative X-rays, or some radiographic comparison. It is a good job, with some improvements it can be a great paper.

#### **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

##### ***Google Search:***

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

##### ***BPG Search:***

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

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Orthopedics

**Manuscript NO:** 52602

**Title:** An observational study of a new modular femoral revision system

**Reviewer's code:** 02691156

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

**Reviewer's country:** Greece

**Author's country:** Denmark

**Manuscript submission date:** 2019-11-11

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-11-11 09:57

**Reviewer performed review:** 2019-11-16 14:59

**Review time:** 5 Days and 5 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The title is referring directly to the problem at hand. The abstract is sufficient. Key words reflect the focus of the manuscript. Introduction You evaluate the efficacy of new design for modular femoral revision system like the ARCOS that provide flexibility and optimal rotation, focusing on early results after surgery. Material and Methods In the present study 116 patients are included with clinical and radiological mean follow up of 4 years. For evaluation of the results, you used the HHS, the OHS and the EQ 5D VAS. "You have recorded the following factors from the electronic journal system: Age, gender, alive/dead, American Society of Anaesthesiologists' score (ASA), year of primary THA, revision number, cause for revision, cemented/uncemented status to be revised, stem to be revised, date of ARCOS surgery, operation-code, proximal body (ARCOS), distal stem (ARCOS), complications during surgery, complications during admission, reoperation of ARCOS (only femur stem, not the cup), date of ARCOS-reoperation". The surgical procedure is not mentioned, neither the amount of bone loss if any. Results The cause for revision was aseptic loosening for the majority of cases. At the clinical evaluation you found acceptable and encouraging outcome as the mean of EQ-5D VAS was 72. The mean HHS result was 83. The mean OHS result was 40. At the x-ray evaluation you found 84 hips with stationary conditions, 6 were re-revised, 2 had a cup-revision, 16 had some subclinical subsidence or clearing and 2 had a healed fracture [but 6 patients are missing]. Discussion According to to you, "the strengths of this study are that it is the first consecutive record of this widely used prosthesis and provides early results of a new product, which is very important to obtain for research and development purposes". Limitations among the limitations of the present investigation according to you are: "The retrospective design and that no randomization has been done. You did not have preoperative HHS, OHS and EQ-5D scores". It should be added the short follow up study for revision cases and the fact that from the 116 individuals that were included to the study, 40 patients declined participation in clinical

and x-ray follow-up. Conclusions The early results of the ARCOS are promising compared with similar studies. You encourage the use of the BS combination, whenever the bone stock proximally is adequate. Illustrations and tables The 2 figures and 2 tables that are included, are sufficient and of good quality. References The present manuscript is supported by 28 latest and important references. The present manuscript is proposing a new modular femoral revision system that provides flexibility and optimal rotation suitable for revision cases. You reported that 40 patients refused to come for follow-up, citing various reasons. Clarification is needed because the reader is left with the impression that the results relate to all 116 patients according to the analysis. No reply to a questionnaire is mentioned, while in the results' chapter six patients are missing. The submitted manuscript possesses valuable information for physicians for the post-operative measurement and assessment of ARCOS revision hip system, and is appropriate, following revision, for publication in the WOJ.

## INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

### *Google Search:*

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

### *BPG Search:*

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



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](http://www.wjgnet.com)