

## ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 10920

**Title:** Cost of external fixation versus external fixation then nailing in treatment of bone infection by segment transfer

**Reviewer code:** 00505420

**Science editor:** Ling-Ling Wen

**Date sent for review:** 2014-04-27 23:33

**Date reviewed:** 2014-04-30 10:14

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting article that looks at the economics of two commonly performed surgeries for infected non unions. I will recommend it for publication after revisions.

The basic flaw in this paper is the study methodology. The authors have excluded their complications from their analysis. This is not right. If a procedure reduces cost overall but has high complication rates that necessitates further medical care and thus indirectly the cost, then it is not justified to perform it. So I will like to see the complication and other issues related to these procedures

I have some suggestions to improve the manuscript.

## ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 10920

**Title:** Cost of external fixation versus external fixation then nailing in treatment of bone infection by segment transfer

**Reviewer code:** 00467030

**Science editor:** Ling-Ling Wen

**Date sent for review:** 2014-04-27 23:33

**Date reviewed:** 2014-05-10 07:07

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a report dealing with the costs of the two commonly implemented operations for infected non-unions of bones. The following point is suggested for further consideration: 1. In the materials and methods section, the authors should explain why they exclude the patients who needed unexpected surgery for complications (the first paragraph of p. 4) as the occurrence of complications will usually demand a high cost during the subsequent procedures of cares. 2. Some minor English grammar checks are needed, for instance, "That include lengthening then nailing technique" (p.2, the third paragraph, line 2) should be corrected as "That includes lengthening then nailing technique".