

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Orthopedics*

Manuscript NO: 65885

Title: Intraosseous device (IOFIX) for arthrodesis in foot and ankle surgery: review of the literature and biomechanical properties

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05329275

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: United Kingdom

Manuscript submission date: 2021-03-18

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-03-21 20:54

Reviewer performed review: 2021-03-21 21:13

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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>

Peer-reviewer statements	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

Dear authors, thank you for submitting your paper to this journal. The topic is interesting, of current and future interest in foot and ankle surgery. The literature on the use of this device is currently scarce, but it is carefully analyzed. The work is well written and focuses on the pros and cons of using the device. In light of the above, I recommend the publication of the paper. Only one note concerns the title: which could be more focused on the topic of interest (IOFIX).

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Orthopedics*

Manuscript NO: 65885

Title: Intraosseous device (IOFIX) for arthrodesis in foot and ankle surgery: review of the literature and biomechanical properties

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 04389493

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Adjunct Professor, Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: United Kingdom

Manuscript submission date: 2021-03-18

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-03-24 08:34

Reviewer performed review: 2021-03-24 17:42

Review time: 9 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" 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

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No
-------------------------------------	---

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Authors It was a pleasure to review this paper. The title reflects the main subject of the manuscript. Abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript, however presents some methodological gaps. Please try to be more concise and use separate sections: Background, Aim, Methods, Results, Conclusions. Key words reflect the focus of the manuscript. Please try to better organize the introduction section.

After this sentence "The fundamental principles of arthrodesis include i) adequate exposure and preparation of joint surfaces, ii) coaptation of the surfaces and iii) rigid fixation of the surfaces until union." some references are needed. This part "Rigidity of fixation is not the only parameter determining successful fusion or healing of a fracture. A balance between rigidity, compression and co-aptation is probably more important..."etc would better fits in the discussion section. Methods are described in adequate detail. Please divide the result section into: CLINICAL STUDIES and CADAVERIC AND IN VITRO STUDIES Acronym should be used all over the text (subtalar (ST), talonavicular (TN), calcaneocuboid (CC), tarsometatarsal (TMT) etc...) Discussion: in order to highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically, please organize the discussion section as reported in the introduction and result sections. At the end of the discussion, the sentence "The senior author of our study with previous experience in intraosseous fixation[8,9] is leading a study with a case series of 1st TMT joint arthrodesis using IOFIX and has encouraging preliminary results." is not relevant. The paper addresses an actual topic and provides an update on the evidence related Only some improvements are needed in order to make it eligible for publication.