

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: 72192

Title: Insufficient lateral stem contact is an influencing factor for significant subsidence

in cementless short stem total hip arthroplasty.

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02696233
Position: Peer Reviewer
Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: France

Author's Country/Territory: Thailand

Manuscript submission date: 2021-10-08

Reviewer chosen by: Qi-Gu Yao (Online Science Editor)

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-12-20 11:35

Reviewer performed review: 2021-12-28 08:38

Review time: 7 Days and 21 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No



Baishideng **Publishing**

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

Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous

statements

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I reviewed with interest the article dealing with cementless short stem subsidence. The series is retrospective with a short term follow up but the lessons and recommendations are relevant. Actually, the discussion only takes into account the insertion of short stems without collar and for the reader it would have been judicious to make a bibliographical analysis of the articles comparing short stems with or without collar. This is in my opinion the weak point of this article and I would like this discussion to be considered in the final redaction. Disclosure chart must be provided



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: 72192

Title: Insufficient lateral stem contact is an influencing factor for significant subsidence

in cementless short stem total hip arthroplasty.

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02699644
Position: Peer Reviewer
Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: New Zealand

Author's Country/Territory: Thailand

Manuscript submission date: 2021-10-08

Reviewer chosen by: Qi-Gu Yao (Online Science Editor)

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-12-20 21:43

Reviewer performed review: 2021-12-28 22:12

Review time: 8 Days

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No



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

Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a retrospective analysis of a short femoral stem over a 2 year period. the authors wished to establish if there were specific risk factors associated with stem subsidence which may be different to traditional stems. Overall they found that lateral stem contact was protective of significant subsidence. The methodology involved 2 observers comparing postop and 2 year radiographs. The measurement methodology seemed appropriate and the interobserver reliability was satisfactory however I have some issues with this: 1 there is no comment on the lateral radiograph. What was the fill in the AP direction? Was there ant ant or post contact with the stem? could this influence stem subsidence? 2 there is no comment on restoration of offset. Presumably the only way to increase offset with this component is to accentuate the varus and increase the lateral contact, likewise to establish reduced offset means placing the stem in valgus thus reducing lat contact. Comments on this are required. 3 With lateral contact you might expect to see lateral cortical thickening (reaction), was this seen? Comment is required. 4 Even with interobserver conformity I would like to see the error included for each measurement. 0.5mm (the mean subsidence) is a small amount to measure on plain The authors suggest that subsidence is a major problem in uncemented radiographs stems and in this study show 12 stems (4%) with subsidence >3mm with none requiring revision at 2 years for loosening, so shouldn't the conclusion be that subsidence is not a major issue even with >3mm and no lateral cortical contact? The English is OK but there are several small errors that need addressing.