



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

Manuscript NO: 68918

Title: Femoral lengthening in young patients. An evidence-based comparison between motorized lengthening nails and external fixation.

Reviewer's code: 03065340

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor, Research Scientist, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Austria

Author's Country/Territory: United Kingdom

Manuscript submission date: 2021-06-08

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-06-12 05:46

Reviewer performed review: 2021-06-20 17:19

Review time: 8 Days and 11 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 Grade E: Do not publish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
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors worked out a systematic review on a very interesting and very specific scientific question in the field of limb lengthening. Title: "Femoral lengthening in young patients" for example is more correct as patients up to 21 were included in the studies. Abstract: Results: results part stated a range from 15 to 18 for the nails – but Black et al. had a range up to 21 (18.2 ± 1.7 (18.6; 15.5-21.2)) The authors conclude that motorized nails are equal or superb in children over 9 years. This needs clarification as motorized nails are not commonly used in this age group – especially not in skeletally immature children. Only Szymczuk included patients below 15 (+/- 5) with significant different ages in the two groups. Discussion: Short analysis and review of non-pediatric or non-femur comparative studies would be interesting. This paper for example compares IM vs. EF pediatric humeral lengthening: Morrison SG, Georgiadis AG, Dahl MT. Lengthening of the Humerus Using a Motorized Lengthening Nail: A Retrospective Comparative Series. *J Pediatr Orthop.* 2020 Jul;40(6):e479-e486. doi: 10.1097/BPO.0000000000001453. PMID: 32501920. Discussion about intramedullary nailing in children and the limitations of this method (particular in skeletally immature patients) would be interesting to point out the clinical relevance of the study. Conclusion; Young patients (e.g.) instead of children.