

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 70260

**Title:** Is it Necessary to Fuse to the Pelvis When Correcting Scoliosis in Cerebral Palsy?

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05237049

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Surgeon

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Italy

**Author's Country/Territory:** United States

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-07-27

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-08-01 10:31

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-08-01 10:53

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you for giving me the possibility to review the manuscript “What Does Fusing the Pelvis in Cerebral Palsy Scoliosis Contribute to Correcting Pelvic Obliquity?”. This paper deals with a very interesting topic for spine surgeons, since it aims to analyse patients with cerebral palsy (CP) with regards to radiographic outcomes and complications as a function of fusion to the pelvis compared with higher levels of fusion. This retrospective study includes 47 patients and shows the pelvis inclusion in the distal level of fusion for cerebral palsy scoliosis places patients at an increased risk of postoperative complications. These authors conclude that, in a select patient population, spinal fusion can be stopped at the distal lumbar levels without adversely affecting the surgical outcomes. The main limitations of the study are clear reported. This article would be of high value to be added to the literature on the subject. However, before considering it for publication on “The World Journal of Orthopedics”, a few issues should be addressed: - Please add a table summarizing the main data of the recruited patients (mean age; gender; BMI; Mean Cobb Angle; Mean pelvic obliquity angle; patients’ diagnosis and comorbidity..) - Please add tables and figures that summarize the statistical analysis findings; - Please add pre-operative and post-operative radiographs of a patient with pelvic fusion and of a patients without pelvic fusion; - Please discuss further the results of the present paper, highlighting its relevance in daily clinical practice.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 70260

**Title:** Is it Necessary to Fuse to the Pelvis When Correcting Scoliosis in Cerebral Palsy?

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 02468118

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MSc, PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Poland

**Author's Country/Territory:** United States

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-07-27

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-07-31 09:11

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-08-13 11:11

**Review time:** 13 Days and 2 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

This is a sound and clear report. The rationale for the study is well explained and justified, and the report is structured according to correct reporting guidelines. My concern addresses the methodology. The Authors have chosen the STROBE reporting guideline for observational studies, the case-control study specific mode. Nonetheless the study has the characteristics of a retrospective, cohort study, with data collection prior to the study began (you use the term 'cohort' in the discussion). Please explain this concern or make appropriate changes to your report and to the STROBE checklist. Also, I would suggest to complement the study title with the design information, so that it is more informative.