



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Orthopedics*

**Manuscript NO:** 89518

**Title:** Expandable endoprostheses in skeletally immature patients: where we are

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05288032

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Assistant Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** China

**Author's Country/Territory:** Germany

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-11-03

**Reviewer chosen by:** Jia-Ru Fan

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-12-25 14:12

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-12-26 10:21

**Review time:** 20 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Novelty of this manuscript</b>	<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
<b>Creativity or innovation of this manuscript</b>	<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



<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<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
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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**

Dear editor, I am pleased to review the submitted paper entitled "Expandable endoprostheses in skeletally immature patients: where we are" The present paper reviewed improvement of extendable endoprosthesis replacements over the years and the comparison between noninvasive prostheses and minimally invasive expandable prostheses. In my opinion the content is original, current, objective and persuasive. But there are some questions need to be address: 1.Please kindly divide maintext to different sections such as noninvasive prostheses; minimally invasive expandable prostheses; expandable joint; expandable nails; complications. 2.Please provide illustrations of different prostheses. 3.Please summarize the studies into a table.