

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568 **E-mail:** office@baishideng.com https://www.wjgnet.com

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

Manuscript NO: 90379

Title: Meta-analysis of the clinical efficacy of the Gamma3 nail versus Gamma3U-blade

system in the treatment of intertrochanteric fractures

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03809896 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Iran

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-12-01

Reviewer chosen by: Yu-Lu Chen

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-12-18 13:49

Reviewer performed review: 2023-12-20 19:20

Review time: 2 Days and 5 Hours

	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C:
Scientific quality	Good
	[] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair
this manuscript	[] Grade D: No creativity or innovation



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568 **E-mail:** office@baishideng.com https://www.wjgnet.com

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No scientific significance
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) [Y] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I think the topic of study is interesting. However, I suggest that authors consider the following points: 1. The Background section is poorly written. The authors should explain more about intertrochanteric fractures and their different treatments. 2. I suggest the authors add a list of abbreviations at the end of the manuscript.