

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

Manuscript NO: 89033

Title: The effect of inflammatory response on joint function after hip fracture in elderly

patients: A clinical study

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 01209736

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: FRCS

Professional title: Professor, Staff Physician, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Canada

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-10-18

Reviewer chosen by: Jin-Lei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2024-01-08 16:07

Reviewer performed review: 2024-01-08 18:54

Review time: 2 Hours

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	[Y] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish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



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) [] Minor revision [Y] 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

Many things that need improvement and clarification in this study. Please address each one of these important features. Introduction - Last sentence - As this is a weak epidemiologic study (retrospective, small, single center), you must say "may be" associated not that "are" associated with a poor outcome. This goes for the conclusion as well as this is only a pilot study that can now establish direction for further study. Methods - Gen info - There is no information about how "bad" this hip was before it was broken. Maybe there was a lot of osteoarthritis or rhematoid in the joint. Maybe these would add to the level of inflammation at the time of surgery. Why was this information not captured? Discuss that point in the Methods and in the Discussion., - Inclusion what about patients with obvious OA or rhematoid or other inflammatory diseases that were admitted into the study? Blood markers may be up already - This is not discussed in the Methods or in the Discussion - please add. - Evaluation - hip fracture length of stay in our trauma hospital is now 1 week in our hospital. What was length of stay in your hospital - make clear and provide information as to when blood tests were done as it is not clear and then when they were reported upon - this is not clear either. - Data



Collection - no information about previous OA or rhematoid in patients. What about infections in patients? With this many patients - some would have had infection. Results - Remove laterality - this makes NO difference and is not published upon. - Table 1 wording - should be Trochanteric not Intertrochanter - When was Fair or Excellent hip function determined - last day in hospital? Make clear. It says 4-6 days after injury. Graphs with outcomes scores would help. What made an Excellent versus a Fair result? Make clear. - Eliminate bleeding volumes from the WHOLE paper. It is too inaccurate to be reportable. What about internal bleeding and bruising? That is not recorded. What about blood thinners - that is not recorded. This is a major weakness of the paper relying upon bleeding volumes which are notoriously inaccurate. Eliminate. - Table 2 - Write out F. - Fair. E. Excellent. - There is no information about who among these patients had wound healing or infection problems. Add and make very clear as this should also correlate to the other numbers. How many infections? Discussion - Eliminate all reference to "bleeding volumes" including Tables as this is notoriously inaccurate. No description of how measured and it is very inaccurate - major weakness of the paper. -There is no discussion about those patients who had pre-existing OA or rheumatoid or infections from surgery. This is a major weakness of the study. There is no mention about patients who died as this group is often dead at a high rate postop. Conclusion -The conclusion is much too firm and should be softened as this is a poor epidemiologic study and so all this study can say is that more work need be done like prospective studies and that these markers "may" be important.



RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics Manuscript NO: 89033 Title: The effect of inflammatory response on joint function after hip fracture in elderly patients: A clinical study Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed Peer-review model: Single blind Reviewer's code: 01209736 **Position:** Peer Reviewer Academic degree: FRCS Professional title: Professor, Staff Physician, Surgeon Reviewer's Country/Territory: Canada Author's Country/Territory: China Manuscript submission date: 2023-10-18 Reviewer chosen by: Huo Liu Reviewer accepted review: 2024-02-19 20:14 Reviewer performed review: 2024-02-19 20:23 Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [Y] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
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) [Y] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous



Baishideng Publishing

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

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Good revision; no deficiencies noted.