

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Orthopedics*

Manuscript NO: 81785

Title: Two surgical pathways for isolated hip fractures: A comparative study

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06347576

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MBBS, MS

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-13

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-01-15 17:22

Reviewer performed review: 2023-01-19 06:21

Review time: 3 Days and 12 Hours

Scientific quality	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input 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 article is good. Just needs some grammatical corrections. Article is good enough to publish.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Orthopedics*

Manuscript NO: 81785

Title: Two surgical pathways for isolated hip fractures: A comparative study

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06109990

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MBChB, N/A

Professional title: Academic Research, Full Professor, Senior Editor, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Iraq

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-13

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-03-01 10:51

Reviewer performed review: 2023-03-03 16:33

Review time: 2 Days and 5 Hours

Scientific quality	<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
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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" 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

The article is well written. However, it needs revision according to the following: 1. Minor editing and English language corrections are necessary. 2. I suggest the following title "Two surgical pathways for isolated hip fractures: A comparative study". 3. The introduction section is deficient in the descriptive part and nothing belongs to the challenging part. 4. I see abbreviations without terms as they appeared at first like HF in the introduction section and vice versa. 5. Methods section a. I think an adult is a person who is older than 18 years, not ≥ 18 years. b. It is better to replace the word "sex" with "gender". 6. The figure legend must be put below the figure. This should apply to all figures. 7. It is better to write the exact P values in Tables 1 and 2. 8. You didn't mention the P values in Table 3, this contradicts the Table legend "Comparison of mean age and hospital length of stay stratified by ASA score".

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Orthopedics*

Manuscript NO: 81785

Title: Two surgical pathways for isolated hip fractures: A comparative study

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05506329

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MBBS, MD

Professional title: Attending Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Nepal

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-13

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-03-04 02:02

Reviewer performed review: 2023-03-04 15:48

Review time: 13 Hours

Scientific quality	<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
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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input 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

please mention the basis for suspicion of difference in outcome between different pathways (rationale of study). it is better to briefly mention how patient are admitted and managed though these pathways, as different center have their own way of practice. please mention which statistical test was used to obtain p value. In the methodolgy section, ROC curve was discussed which could not be found in the result.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Orthopedics*

Manuscript NO: 81785

Title: Two surgical pathways for isolated hip fractures: A comparative study

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06109990

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MBChB, N/A

Professional title: Academic Research, Full Professor, Senior Editor, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Iraq

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-13

Reviewer chosen by: Xiao-Fang Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-03-24 06:10

Reviewer performed review: 2023-03-24 09:07

Review time: 2 Hours

Scientific quality	<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
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
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

I appreciate the great effort of the authors in revising the manuscript. I hope to see the article published soon. A few points need to be revised as I mentioned them in the attached file.