

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: 74560 Title: DISTAL FEMUR COMPLEX FRACTURES IN ELDERLY PATIENTS TREATED WITH MEGAPROSTHESIS: RESULTS IN A CASE SERIES OF ELEVEN PATIENTS Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed Peer-review model: Single blind Reviewer's code: 02694731 **Position:** Editorial Board Academic degree: MD, PhD Professional title: Adjunct Professor, Doctor, Senior Lecturer, Surgeon Reviewer's Country/Territory: Switzerland Author's Country/Territory: Italy Manuscript submission date: 2021-12-29 Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique Reviewer accepted review: 2022-01-07 11:52 Reviewer performed review: 2022-01-12 11:13 Review time: 4 Days and 23 Hours [V] Grade A·Excellent [] Grade B: Verv good [] Grade C: Good

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<ul> <li>[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing</li> <li>[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection</li> </ul>
Conclusion	[Y] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [] 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

DEar Authors, this is a well-written manuscript with a clear message. I do recommend publication of this manuscript.



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: 74560 Title: DISTAL FEMUR COMPLEX FRACTURES IN ELDERLY PATIENTS TREATED WITH MEGAPROSTHESIS: RESULTS IN A CASE SERIES OF ELEVEN PATIENTS Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed Peer-review model: Single blind **Reviewer's code:** 05866874 **Position:** Peer Reviewer Academic degree: PhD Professional title: Physiotherapist, Professor, Senior Lecturer Reviewer's Country/Territory: Spain Author's Country/Territory: Italy Manuscript submission date: 2021-12-29 Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique Reviewer accepted review: 2022-01-27 08:54 Reviewer performed review: 2022-01-29 11:13 Review time: 2 Days and 2 Hours ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good L Scientific quality ] 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	[ ]Yes [Y]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

Thank you very much for your dedication and effort in this work, here Dear Authors: are some ideas to improve your manuscript: - The introduction is correct, however in the material and methods section you should specify certain aspects more. Why do you consider over 85 years of age as an inclusion criterion? you should describe it. How do you carry out the study of the sample of 11 patients, why? How do you include the 10 women and one man, why? You should expand on this information. - They say that they carry out a subsequent follow-up, but they do not describe how this follow-up is carried out, at home, by telephone, outpatient, etc. They should describe it. - In the results they describe that there is improvement in all the variables studied, but in my point of view they should express these favourable changes as a percentage of change or as an index of minimum change or something similar that could fit in this section. Otherwise, this section would lack statistical analysis, even if it is simple, they should add it to justify that scientific evidence in their treatment. Regards.