



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Orthopedics*

Manuscript NO: 83018

Title: Catania Flatfoot Score: A diagnostic-therapeutic evaluation tool in children

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06344476

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Teacher

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2023-01-03

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-01-10 04:50

Reviewer performed review: 2023-01-17 21:07

Review time: 7 Days and 16 Hours

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Scientific quality | <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 Grade E: Do not publish |
| Novelty of this manuscript | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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

Pleased to review a nicely written article dwelling on a pertinent issue. Authors deserve applause for the effort. However, there are some minor concerns that need to be addressed. 1. Title: I believe, it could have been more inclusive; can add " for Child" in the title. 2. "Introduction" should elaborate with previously published tool/scale for the FFF and their merits and demerits for formation of your research problem. 3. In the subsection 2.1.1, citation is missing for development of CTF.(second sentence of para 1). 4. Full form of VP, GT, AV. 5.In the sub-section 2.1.2, 80 is the scoring of current subjects or is it scoring of questionnaire minimum score. Although, in the questionnaire each domain has zero value, then how is it minimum 80. Same 170. Elaborate with justification. 6.250 in the formula. Why 250? Elaborate with justification. 7. How the patient with Flexible flat foot is segregate from rigid flat foot. Explain in the sub-section 2.2. 8. Define the none, mild, and severe for each domain. Similar for Yes and No. 9. Result section, there should be the summarized result (table) of each domine of scale for better understanding. 10. Figure 1. Label the axis. 11.Content of the Figure 2 and 3 should be visible. Improve the quality. 12. Discuss about result and



**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

interpretation in subsection 3.3. 13. What are the future directions of this topic described in discussion section?



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Orthopedics*

Manuscript NO: 83018

Title: Catania Flatfoot Score: A diagnostic-therapeutic evaluation tool in children

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer’s code: 04225001

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer’s Country/Territory: Poland

Author’s Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2023-01-03

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-03-23 09:59

Reviewer performed review: 2023-03-27 18:21

Review time: 4 Days and 8 Hours

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Scientific quality | <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 |
| Novelty of this manuscript | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input 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 authors have created a new tool that will be useful in determining the optimal treatment path for pediatric patients with foot problems. It is an innovative questionnaire that will improve the diagnosis process. The aim of the work was clearly defined, the methodology of the procedure was properly planned and implemented. Adequate statistical analysis tools were used. The authors should definitely explain who the questionnaire is intended for. The title does not indicate for which patients (children or adults) this tool was created. In the summary, in the conclusions it was written that for children. However, in the conclusions at the end of the discussion it was written that for juvenile flexible flatfoot. The questionnaire sheet shows that the respondents can be from 0 years old to more than 14 years old (no upper age limit has been set). Isn't it a limitation of the assessment of the questionnaire that the condition of inclusion in the study was "chronological age 17-years-old"? The study group was very homogeneous in terms of age, in this case this may be a disadvantage. Please also clearly emphasize that the proper assessment and indication for surgery also requires (in addition to the features resulting from the questionnaire) the assessment of the entire



**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

body posture (for example, comparing the length of the limbs) and a detailed history of diseases, family history, etc. The tool proposed by the authors will be a very good help, but care should be taken when making a final diagnosis.