

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Orthopedics*

Manuscript NO: 87661

Title: Triggering, clicking, locking and crepitus of the finger: A comprehensive overview

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05630740

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: South Korea

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2023-08-21

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-09-04 05:03

Reviewer performed review: 2023-09-06 06:12

Review time: 2 Days and 1 Hour

| | |
|---|--|
| 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 Grade E: Do not publish |
| Novelty of this manuscript | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty |
| Creativity or innovation of this manuscript | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation |

| | |
|---|--|
| Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance |
| 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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 |

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The abstract is wordy and exceeds the limit of the usual 200-word count or less. The reference list is sparse, indicating the high likelihood of the lack of a thorough literature search. I have also sporadically detected numerous sentence fragments, run-ons, and grammatical errors. Please consider English language services input. Clinicians must be conceded to the fact that high-quality medical writing is critically essential to professionalism and important. In general, authors should generate their defense by addressing the following inquiries: - WHAT DO WE CURRENTLY KNOW ABOUT THIS CONDITION? - WHAT ARE THE CURRENT THEORIES THAT DRIVE THE CLINICAL APPLICATIONS IN THE MANAGEMENT? - WHY STUDY THIS QUESTION FURTHER? - WHAT SPECIFICALLY REQUIRES FURTHER INVESTIGATION DUE TO LACK OF EVIDENCE, CONTRADICTIONS, AND LIMITATIONS? - WHAT CONTRIBUTIONS WILL YOUR WORK MAKE TO THIS FIELD? Authors are reminded that the purpose of a mini review is to summarize and evaluate the literature to show relationships between different studies; bearing in mind that one of the aims of a review article is to compare and contrast along



**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

with the interpretation of the works of others. This aspect is heavily lacking in this manuscript. Moreover, although prompted to show how published work relates to their work, authors should not fall into the habit of emphasizing their own work or field of research effort. In addition, the concluding remarks are suboptimal and not very convincing. I strongly encourage authors to address these areas of concern. Please make necessary revisions and re-submit.